

# THE CATHOLIC MIND

VOL. XLIII

JULY, 1945

NO. 991

## *The Pope on V-E Day*

*Radio Address by the Holy Father on May 9, 1945*

**H**ERE at last we behold the end of this war, which, during almost six years, has held Europe in the grip of the most atrocious suffering and most bitter sorrow.

A cry of humble and ardent gratitude arises from the very depths of Our heart to "the Father of Mercies and the God of All Consolation."

But Our canticle of thanksgiving is accompanied with the suppliant prayer to implore also of Divine Omnipotence and Goodness the termination, in accord with justice, of the sanguinary warfare in the Far East.

On Our knees in spirit before the tombs, before the ravines disturbed and reddened by blood, where repose the innumerable corpses of those who have fallen, victims of the fighting or of inhuman massacres, of hunger or of misery, We recommend them all in Our prayers, and especially in the celebration of the Holy Sacrifice, to the merciful love of Jesus Christ, their Saviour and their Judge.

And it seems to Us that they, the fallen, are giving warning to the survivors of this cruel scourge and are saying to them: Let there arise from the earth, wherein we have been placed as grains of wheat, the molders and builders of a new and better Europe, of a new and better universe, founded on the filial fear of God, on fidelity to His Holy Commandments, on respect for human dignity, on the sacred principle of equality of the rights of all peoples and all states, large and small, weak and strong.

The war has created on all sides chaotic ruin, both material and moral, such as mankind has never known in the entire course of human history. The task of this hour is to rebuild the world.

As the first element of this restoration, We long to see, after so long a period of waiting, the prompt and speedy return, in so far as circumstances permit, of the prisoners, of the interned, combatants and civilians, to their homes and to their wives, children and the noble works of peace.

To all them We say: Let not your energy flag nor your courage fail; dedicate yourselves ardently to the work of reconstruction, sustained by a strong faith in Divine Providence. Apply yourselves to labor, each one at his post, resolute and determined, with a heart animated by a generous, indestructible love of one's fellow-man.

It is difficult, certainly, but it is also a holy undertaking that awaits you in repairing the immediate and disastrous consequences of the war. We refer to the decay of public order, misery and hunger, the relaxing and brutalizing of customs and usages, the lack of discipline among the youth.

By so doing, little by little, you will prepare for your cities and your villages, for your provinces and your fatherlands, a lot more acceptable and renewed vigor to your blood.

With the threat of death lying in wait driven from the earth, from the sea and from the sky, the lives of men, creatures of God, and that which remains to them of their private and common possession henceforth assured by the laying down of arms, men can now set free their minds and spirits to the building of the peace.

If we limit ourselves to consideration of Europe, we find ourselves face to face now with gigantic problems and difficulties which we must overcome if we wish to plan the way to a true peace, the only one that can be lasting.

Peace, indeed, cannot flower and prosper except in an atmosphere of secure justice and of perfect fidelity, joined with reciprocal trust, mutual understanding and benevolence.

The war has aroused everywhere discord, suspicion and hatred. If, therefore, the world wishes to regain peace, it is necessary that falsehood and rancor should vanish and in their stead that sovereign truth and charity should reign.

Above all, however, in our daily prayers, we should beseech God constantly to fulfil His promise made by the mouth of the Prophet Ezekiel:

And I will give them one heart, and will put a new spirit in their bowels; and I will take away the stony heart out of their flesh: that they may walk in my commandments, and keep my judgments, and do them: and that they may be my people, and I may be their God.

May the Lord God deign to create this new spirit, His spirit, in peoples, and particularly in the hearts of those to whom He has entrusted the responsibility of establishing the future peace.

Then and only then will the reborn world avoid the return of the thunderous scourge of war and there will reign a true, stable and universal brotherhood, and that peace guaranteed by Christ even on earth to those who are willing to believe and trust in His law of love.



### *F. D. R. and the Church*

The relations which the late President of the United States sought to sustain with the Catholic Church, in a firm Christian faith, are now a symbol of the highest significance, in view of the general approval given to the life-work of this prominent statesman. They must be viewed in the light of the best traditions, which go back to the friendly relations existing between George Washington and the Bishop of Baltimore, Monsignor Carroll, which culminated in that famous letter which the great founder sent to the prelate on March 12, 1790. It is a truth full of solace that in the light of these traditions Roosevelt realized in his first term as President what heroic and fruitful vitality was inherent in the Roman Church, and that he gave expression to that realization. He was, in fact, a proud admirer and an admirable supporter of the Church.—*The OSSERVATORE ROMANO*.

### *Ejaculatory Prayer*

One might wonder what connection there is between a lance and prayer, yet the word "ejaculation" comes from the Latin word *jacula*, which means a lance. A little thought makes the matter clear. An ejaculatory prayer is a short fervent act of praise, petition or thanksgiving, which flows from the human heart directed like an arrow or a lance at Almighty God,

# Four Phases of Russian Internationalism

N. S. TIMASHEFF

*Reprinted from THOUGHT\**

**W**HEN the Communists won control over Russia, their main preoccupation was to submit that country to a complete transformation on the basis of their doctrine. But this was not their only aim. According to the very Doctrine, the new rulers of Russia had to destroy national States throughout the world and organize Humanity into a Universal Proletarian Society. The means to that end was International Communist Revolution.

This end was not independent of the transformation of society on the Marxist pattern, but, on the contrary, closely related to it. More exactly, according to the Doctrine, one end could not be achieved without the other. Capitalism, said the founding fathers of Marxism, is international by its very nature. To resist international capital and, later on, to defeat it, the proletarians must unite and create a universal proletarian front. Though the proletarians may like individual products of bourgeois culture, they ought not to care for the national cultures as wholes. The national differentiation of cultures is, in Marxist doctrine, one of the tools used by the capitalists to preserve their domination. Pointing to the differences of

individual cultures and emphasizing the nations as entities, the capitalists divert the interest of the proletarians from the only significant social process—class struggle—to a number of nonessential processes, among them the struggle between the nations and their cultures. Gaining power, the proletarians may preserve some elements of national, bourgeois cultures; but, once victorious throughout the world, they must create a new world culture, in the framework of Universal Proletarian Society.

These ideas were fully shared by the group which gained power in Russia as the result of "the October victory." Looking around them, they defined the situation in these terms: All the world, except Russia, is under the power of capitalists. These capitalists are fully aware of their class interest and therefore they cannot permit the defeat of Russian capitalism to become final. If they did, the victorious proletariat of Russia would become a center of crystallization around which the forces of the international proletariat would gather to give the death blow to capitalism. Merciless war between world capitalism and the First Socialist State, Russia, seemed then unavoidable.

\* Fordham University, New York 58, N. Y., March, 1945



Measuring the forces of the two camps, the new leaders were not over-optimistic. In the course of the first few months, perhaps years, they were fully prepared for a crushing defeat. The only chance of survival, they thought, was the tremendous disturbance produced in the ranks of capitalists by the World War. Could the Communists not profit from this circumstance to enlarge the fissure in the capitalist building? Was this not the only means to preserve power in Russia and, perhaps, to gain it throughout the world?

#### THE AGGRESSIVE PHASE

"International imperialism disposing of the might of capital cannot co-exist with the Soviet Republic. Conflict is unavoidable and here is the greatest difficulty of the Russian Revolution, its greatest historical task, that of provoking the international revolution."<sup>1</sup> Thus spoke Lenin at the Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Russia which had to decide the problem of peace with Germany (March, 1918). For long years to come, these words were repeated with slight variations. "We are the Party of the World Revolution, not of the Russian Revolution," said Zinovyev in 1925.<sup>2</sup> One year later, Stalin said: "The revolution in the USSR is only

part of the world revolution, its beginning and the base for its successful advance."<sup>3</sup>

In consequence, for many years after the Revolution the main purpose of the foreign policy of the First Socialist State was to foster Communist Revolution throughout the world. In the light of the Doctrine, this was not merely proselytism, but rather a measure of self-preservation.

"Socialism in one country is impossible." This was Lenin's thesis explaining the aggressive character of the internationalism of the Russian Communists during the first decade of their rule. To the challenge of the inevitable attack of the capitalist coalition, the creation of the Third, or Communist, International (Comintern) was the adequate response. It was informally founded in 1918, in Moscow, using the presence of numerous foreigners, especially of prisoners of war. Indoctrinated foreigners were united into "foreign groups" from among which, later on, "hundreds of thousands" were sent abroad to play the part of "the bacilli of Bolshevism." Members of these groups formed also the bulk of a gathering held in Moscow, in March, 1919. This gathering, re-enforced by a few persons especially invited from foreign countries, resulted in the formal found-

<sup>1</sup> Lenin, *Collected Works* (Second Russian Edition), vol. 22, p. 37.

<sup>2</sup> *Proceedings of the XIV Congress of the Russian Communist Party*, 1926, p. 354 (in Russian).

<sup>3</sup> *Proceedings of the XV Congress of the Russian Communist Party*, 1927, p. 46 (in Russian).

dation of the Comintern and was reckoned as its First World Congress.<sup>4</sup>

Statutes were elaborated. Taken at face value, they meant a drastic change in the Russian situation: the Communist Party of Russia, like every other Communist Party, became a "section" of the new world organization; supreme power seemed to have been shifted to it from the Russian leaders. The first president of the International was Zinovyev, and Lenin seemed to have become one of his subordinates.

In reality, from the start, the inequality of the partners was obvious. The Russian Communist Party had at its disposal the means of one of the largest States in the world. The other parties represented minorities of the labor movement in different countries, sometimes maintaining an illegal existence, always penniless. Consequently, the Russian Party, more exactly, its leaders were able to dominate the organization which, in fact, became merely a branch of the new Russian bureaucracy. Zinovyev was never Lenin's superior. For a certain time, he was Lenin's foreign minister since, up to the late twenties, the actual foreign policy of the Soviet State was carried out through the Comintern and not through the Commissariat of Foreign Affairs.

According to the directions given by the leaders, the activity of the Comintern was concentrated on two

closely related ends: 1) provoking and fostering revolutionary movements, wherever possible, but especially in Germany which was held to be most responsive to Communist propaganda,<sup>5</sup> and in the colonies and dependencies of the great powers, and 2) struggling against the "social traitors," or the socialist parties adhering to the Second International; these parties were obviously the most dangerous competitors of the Communists in the struggle for leadership in the Labor class.

#### BLIND TO REALITY

The creation of the Communist International was apprehended by the "bourgeois" society with the same indeterminate fear as, half a century earlier, the creation of the First one had been. This fear seemed to have been justified by such events as the Bavarian and the Hungarian Communist Revolutions and numerous Communist upheavals in Europe, China and the colonies. But nothing of decisive importance followed; the World Revolution, that supreme hope of the Communists, the point of orientation of their eschatology, failed to materialize.

Nevertheless, the obsession by the Doctrine made the rulers blind to reality and especially to the particular interests of Russia. When in July, 1920, the Red Army seemed to be

<sup>4</sup> Adapted from Lenin's authentic report, *Collected Works*, vol. 24, pp. 128 and 247.

<sup>5</sup> On the basis of collective frustration caused by the defeat and the treatment by the victors,

near to victory over Poland, Lord Curzon offered the Soviets a demarcation line giving Russia Western Belorussia and Western Ukraine. The Soviet government declined the offer and declared that it could give Poland a much more favorable frontier provided that a "workers' and peasants' government" be established in Warsaw. A virtual success of the World Revolution proved to weigh heavier than the real interest of Russia in the acquisition of two provinces. No workers' and peasants' government emerged in Poland, the Red Army was beaten and the Soviet government had to sign the peace treaty of Riga (1921).

Despite the uninterrupted series of failures and disappointments, up to 1927 internationalism entirely dominated the policy of Russia's rulers. Then, step by step, departures from the original setup began, first only slight, but gradually increasing in significance so that, later on, the entire structure collapsed.

But let us begin with the earliest phases of the process. The weakness of the support granted by the Western capitalists to the White Movement in Russia which the Communists interpreted as the vanguard of international capitalism; the complete cessation of support in 1921; the tendency of the capitalist States to start "trading with cannibals" (Lloyd George); the competition between capitalist States as to who would be first to

recognize the Soviet government and to sign with it advantageous commercial treaties—all these facts were not in accordance with expectation in the line of the Doctrine. Did they not prove that capitalism was decaying and that the International Revolution was just around the corner?

But there were other facts showing that the development had followed other ways than those foreseen by Marx and Lenin. Communist regimes in Bavaria (1918) and Hungary (1919) were short-lived. The revolutionary situation which obtained in Germany in 1923 was dissipated without revolutionary outbreak. And, in 1922, in Italy, a revolution opposite to Marxist expectation, a preventive revolution against the Communist danger occurred making Italy almost invulnerable to Communist propaganda.

The real fact was this: the process of senescence was going on within liberal capitalism, but not within capitalism as such. A large-scale transformation of capitalist society was taking place, manifested partly in Fascist revolutions, partly in grand-style social reforms of which the American New Deal is typical. Among the Communist leaders, the real process gave rise to two divergent schools of thought. Trotsky and his followers drew the conclusion that the attack on capitalism should be strengthened to the limit of possibility. Stalin was the first to formulate the opposite

theory of "Socialism in one country." "The Soviet regime," he said in 1925, "possesses all the requisites for the upbuilding of a fully socialized society provided it can overcome its internal difficulties. We are witnessing a temporary stabilization of capitalism and the stabilization of the Soviet regime. A temporary equilibrium has been established between the two stabilizations. This compromise is the basic feature of the present situation."<sup>6</sup>

#### THE PHASE OF AMBIVALENT INTERNATIONALISM

The actual meaning of the struggle between Trotsky (seconded by Zinovyev and Kamenev) and Stalin was the conflict of the old idea of the impossibility of socialism in one country and the new idea of its possibility. In this struggle Stalin gained the upper hand, and the effect was a complete change in the corresponding chapter of the Doctrine: before Stalin's victory, the idea of preserving socialism in Russia without socialist revolution throughout the world was held a heresy. After the victory, the main heresy was seen in the idea that international revolution was a necessary condition of the survival of the First Socialist State. Before Stalin's victory, anyone who believed in socialism in one country was demoted or exiled; after his victory, those were demoted

and exiled who did *not* believe in socialism in one country.

In this way, the Internationalism of the Communists received a new shape. Stalin and his associates did not renounce the International Socialist Revolution. But that revolution ceased to obsess them. If this revolution materializes well and good; but if it does not, ruling over one sixth of the earth remains an interesting possibility. After 1928, the internationalism of the Russian Communists was no longer as it had been; perhaps, it could be termed "ambivalent."<sup>7</sup>

The change in the official system of values was reflected in these facts. Up to 1928 the head of the Comintern (Zinovyev, then Bukharin) were members of the Politbureau. After 1928, its heads (Manuilsky, then Dimitrov) had to stay outside of it. In other words, the Ministry of International Revolution, or the Comintern, was demoted to the rank of a secondary ministry whose head does not participate in the private council of the supreme leader. Another symptom was the factual discontinuation of the Congress of the Comintern: after the Sixth Congress (1928) seven years passed before the Seventh and last was held.

In the late twenties and early thirties, that is, during the period of ambivalent internationalism, the

<sup>6</sup> Speech to the Moscow Party officials, May 9, 1925.

<sup>7</sup> This is a term borrowed from psychoanalysis; it might be used to designate situations when prediction as to the response of a person or group is ambiguous, the respective chances being 50-50.

Communist leaders interpreted the situation in this way: Socialism was victorious in one country only. The other nations had not adhered to the Gospel of Marxism, because of the inertness of the masses, of the nefarious activity of the social traitors, and of the protective measures of the class-conscious bourgeois. Therefore, the environment was hostile and, for the USSR, the horizon was cloudy. The capitalists had not yet attacked the "only socialist country," but the attack was only postponed, not altogether abandoned. There were no means to guess in what form the forthcoming "capitalist coalition" would materialize; but, most probably, the attack would come on the part of the "imperialists" of France and England. This expectation was symbolized in "the four empty chairs" which, in one of the political trials, were destined for Poincaré, Sir A. Chamberlain, Sir Henry Deterding and a Russian "White Guardist," formerly a rich industrialist.<sup>8</sup> The League of Nations continued to be considered as an association of warmongers, a disguise of the coming capitalist coalition against Russia. Its leaders were ridiculed and assailed, time and again burned in effigy, to-

gether with the Pope and a few businessmen, first of all the same Sir Henry Deterding.

But since the capitalist environment of the "only socialist State" was there, some form of adjustment was necessary. The signature of the Briand-Kellogg pact (August 31, 1928) was one of the earliest manifestations of the rising theory that, between the capitalist and the Communist worlds, peaceful coexistence was temporarily possible. There followed non-aggression pacts with Russia's neighbors, not very strong, but still needing to be eliminated from the forthcoming anti-Soviet Coalition.<sup>9</sup>

But despite the pacts, the activity of the Comintern continued. The Sixth Congress (1928) ratified a militant program which, among other things, demanded that the Communists be defeatists with respect to their own countries. As to the "social traitors," in 1929 Molotov said: "Today more than ever any coalition between revolutionists (Communists) and reformists (Socialists) is harmful and inadmissible."<sup>10</sup> Lozovsky added: "Antagonizing workers against the Social Democrats is the most important task of the Comintern."<sup>11</sup>

<sup>8</sup> This trial took place in 1934. Unfortunately for the prosecution, the Russian industrialist in question died many years before his alleged participation in the international plot directed against the Soviet Union.

<sup>9</sup> Nonaggression pacts signed with Germany and Turkey, still under the sign of aggressive internationalism, and the meaning of covert alliance. The pact with Lithuania (1926) was due to the peculiar position of that little country which saw in the Soviet Union a virtual protector against Poland. The real series began with the pact with Finland (January 21, 1932).

<sup>10</sup> *Proceedings of the Executive Committee of the Comintern*, July 29, 1929 (in Russian).

<sup>11</sup> *Proceedings of the Executive Committee of the (Red) International of Trade Unions*, 1929, p. 583 (in Russian).

Fruits of his senseless policy matured a few years later, in Hitler's ascent to power.

#### ANCILLARY INTERNATIONALISM

Duality represented in the non-aggression pacts and in the subversive activity of the Comintern was characteristic of the period of ambivalent internationalism. Events outside of Russia, especially Hitler's rise to power and the German-Polish pact (January, 1934), compelled the Communists once more to revise their position. From 1934 on, internationalism was in the stage of self-defense, and the new position was clearly expressed in the subordination of the activity of the Comintern to the official foreign policy of the Soviets.

In the latter, changes were drastic. Overnight, the League of Nations became the bulwark of peace-loving nations against virtual aggressors. Its leaders were declared to be exponents of that sensible trend within capitalism which realized the possibility of peaceful coexistence with the First Socialist State. Joining the League which, a few months earlier, had been considered sheer impossibility, a mortal sin against the Doctrine, now became the purest expression of Communism. In consequence, the First Socialist State applied for membership and when this was granted (September 18, 1934) this was praised as an important victory. Litvinov, the foreign commissar at that time, be-

came one of the greatest champions of the League; nobody was more eager than he to promote the idea of collective security.

Collective security did not, however, become an article of faith in place of the original article which demanded that the Communists help overthrow any bourgeois government and undermine any bourgeois army. Collective security was chosen as the best device available, given certain circumstances, to prevent destruction through successful Fascist aggression. Therefore, if circumstances changed, departure from the principle of collective security was possible without real change in the new setup of Soviet foreign policy.

Such a departure was indicated when events proved that the system of collective security was but an illusion, not a real guarantee. The appeasement policy of France and Great Britain which reached its climax at Munich (September, 1938) imposed a reversal of the policy of the Soviet State. From collective security it shifted to something akin to "splendid isolation." This was however no longer the "self-blockade" of the twenties when the Soviet State disdained to keep company with other States since it was alone a righteous State based on the Doctrine, whereas the others were sinners doomed to destruction through the cataclysm of the inevitable International Revolution. No, this was isolationism of the

"bourgeois" type to which a State recurs when its leaders, rightly or wrongly, consider that this policy best subserves its interest. From Munich to the outbreak of the Russo-German war the Communists considered the capitalist world as consisting of two equally bad camps, one looking for the best moment to attack the Soviet Union, the other untrustworthy, ready to sacrifice the Soviet Union in the name of appeasement.

The best policy in this situation seemed to be provocation of an armed conflict between the two camps with the intention of remaining neutral as long as possible and of intervening at the last moment, in the hope of gaining some advantages, especially security in a world shaken by a long and exhaustive conflict. This was the policy of the Soviet State between 1938 and 1941, comparable with the policy of many "bourgeois" governments. Did not for instance Napoleon III expect a long and exhaustive war between Russia and Austria and hope for aggrandizement for France as price for mediation, provided that she was able to preserve her military strength while the others fought?

In concrete circumstances, strict neutrality would probably have delayed, if not prevented, war between Fascism and Democracy. The outbreak of the conflict was to be precipitated, and this could be reached by assuming the position of benevolent neutrality in favor of the presumably

weaker, that is, the Fascist camp. Litvinov, the protagonist of collective security and the League of Nations policy, was ostentatiously dismissed and replaced by Molotov, a yes-man not identified with any definite policy (May, 1939). Parallel negotiations with the two camps made it possible to check the correctness of the diagnosis: partnership with Democracy headed by the appeasers was of no good; partnership with Fascism was the lesser evil. Finally, the choice was made, the friendship pact with Hitler signed (August 23, 1939), the signal for the Second World War given.

This is not the place to judge the moral aspect or the expediency of the Soviet policy of the years 1938-41. What matters in this context is that this policy was by no means determined by the Doctrine. The Communist Doctrine shaped by Lenin and applied about the end of the First World War was violent defeatist propaganda in the two camps, in the hope of transforming the Imperialist War into Civil War and of launching the International Revolution. In 1938, subversive Communist propaganda was resumed, but only within one of the camps, that of Democracy. Moreover, officially, even ostentatiously, help was granted to the camp of Fascism so that, from 1939 to 1941, the Soviet Union could be considered a nonbelligerent partner of the Axis. This situation was so obvious that, early in 1940, in influential French

and British circles the question was debated whether the democracies should not declare war on the Soviet Union.

#### AGAINST ITS WILL

From the policy of benevolent neutrality toward the Axis the Soviet Union was removed against its will. Circumstances made it an ally of the democracies. This change was performed reluctantly, only because no other choice was left. For at least two years the Soviet Union waged a kind of *guerra nostra*, a war parallel with that of the United Nations, but not identical with it. Quite a few lessons had to be learned by the Soviet leaders before they finally chose to become one of the senior partners in the great coalition. But their reluctance was not based on Communist principles. The question whether a Communist State might help capitalist States win a war was not discussed.<sup>12</sup> Their reluctance was based on unpleasant reminiscences of the cooperation attempted in 1934-8 and on the alleged possibility of being delivered as spoils to the Fascists in the course of a new access of appeasement.

Once more, no moral judgment or utilitarian evaluation of this reluctance should be attempted at this point. What is important, is that the policy was no longer dictated by the Communist Doctrine. In new condi-

tions, there was simply no use for it.

A parallel development took place in the management of the activities of the foreign Communist parties through the Comintern. Very symptomatically, an open acknowledgment of failure took place, similar to Lenin's acknowledgment of failure in 1921, but quite exceptional under Stalin's rule. The failure was recognized at the seventh and last Congress of the Comintern held in Moscow in the summer of 1935. The recognition of failure was accompanied by the elaboration of a new policy. This was the strategy of the Popular or Common Front. Radical bourgeois parties were no longer implacable class enemies, social democrats no longer social traitors. Suddenly, they became valuable allies in the struggle against Fascism recognized to be the aggressive branch of capitalism, whereas Democracy was assigned the role of a good neighbor. Since Democracy and Socialism were threatened at the same time as Communism, alliance was offered them. If other groups, like the Catholics, appeared to be hostile to Fascism and eager to fight it, all the better: alliance should be offered to them also.

Now, the Comintern had to adapt the Communist movement of each country to the particular role assigned to it in the general plan of the Moscow leaders. If a particular country

<sup>12</sup> The analogous question whether a Christian and democratic State may help an atheist State was much discussed in this country before Pearl Harbor.



was a prospective ally, the Communists of the country had to become fervent patriots especially interested in the valor and efficacy of the army. If it was a prospective enemy, the old tactic could be maintained. In 1935, Stalin declared that a strong French army was a great asset for the Soviet Union. What a blow this was to the French Communists who for fifteen years had displayed every imaginable subversive technique to undermine the army! But, for the Communists, an order from Moscow was beyond discussion. Overnight, the French Communists became fervent patriots and great admirers of the Army—only to resume anti-militaristic propaganda once more in 1939.

The shift of internationalism from the ambivalent to the ancillary phase produced real consternation among orthodox Communists of the foreign parties. Up to 1935 anyone was guilty of heresy who preached alliance with social traitors and bourgeois governments. Now, he was a heretic if he denied the soundness of such a policy.

Nevertheless, even in the course of this period the basic doctrine as modified in 1927 was not completely abandoned. Very conclusive is this statement made by Stalin in 1938: "The victory of socialism in Russia is not complete because the danger of intervention from capitalist countries continues. The problem can be solved

only by uniting the serious efforts of the international proletariat with still more serious efforts of the entire Soviet people."<sup>13</sup>

The foreign Communist parties were curbed, but not disbanded—and for reasons. First, the existence of these well-disciplined agencies was very convenient in negotiations with foreign powers; the promise to muzzle them was a valuable item to be given only for a substantial counterpart. Secondly, a reversal in the international situation was not out of the question and in new conditions the foreign Communists could be once more used.

The official policy of the period of ancillary internationalism contained, however, an element which proved fatal to the former instrument of aggressive internationalism, the Comintern. This policy implied frequent changes in the directions to the Communist parties abroad, and the final effect of these variations was the wholesale discredit of Communist movements everywhere. The leaders of the individual parties who, in reality, were salaried officers of a particular branch of the Soviet bureaucracy did not mind obeying provided that they continued being paid. But the followers, that is, the prospective soldiers of the army of the Communist revolution could not be so easily persuaded to change their minds every few months. Especially detri-

<sup>13</sup> Letter to Comrade Ivanov, published in *Pravda*, February 14, 1938.

mental, for the cohesion of the Communist Brotherhood, was the shift from collective security to cobelligerency with the Axis and the forcible change of sides effected through the German attack.

Though the complete degradation of the Comintern was an obvious fact, still its dissolution, on May 22, 1943, was received throughout the world as a surprise. In reality, this was much more the recognition of a fact than a positive action: the Comintern was dead and could not be revived. Nevertheless, the declaration of dissolution was an adroit gesture. It appeased, at least partly, the fears of those groups in the allied countries who were afraid that, in helping the Soviets wage war against Germany, their countries were eventually helping the forthcoming World Revolution. It prevented secessions and revolts in the ranks of the foreign Communist parties the leaders of which could no longer distribute subsidies, and everybody in the Moscow center knew that the cohesion of these parties entirely depended on money.<sup>14</sup> It satisfied the Russians who were eager to fight for their national interests, but not for the sake of the International Revolution. It brought the entire foreign policy of the Soviets into conformity with the internal development characterized by an overwhelming outburst of nationalism and hostility to

internationalism, the *idée force* of the Comintern.

The Comintern died of a long, painful sickness which began almost immediately after its birth, since it was never permitted to develop according to its nature and was always forced to live as a prisoner of the new rulers of Russia. The sickness was aggravated in 1935 when the leader had to quit the paths traced in accordance with the Doctrine. When the Comintern died, nobody in the world mourned the decease of this monstrous being. Perhaps, Hitler and Mussolini were a little worried about the disappearance of one of the most vulnerable targets of their propaganda.

#### ESOTERIC INTERNATIONALISM

The dissolution of the Comintern terminated that phase of internationalism which may be called ancillary. If, in the hearts of the Communist leaders, hope of the International Communist Revolution persists, it is no longer manifested in outward actions or embodied in institutions. Internationalism is now in the esoteric phase. The leaders, including Stalin, probably continue to believe that capitalism is doomed to collapse and that the future belongs to Communism which, sooner or later, must become the universal pattern of social and economic organization—the possibility

<sup>14</sup> In 1940, the Communist Party of America withdrew from the Comintern to avoid the necessity of registering according to the Registration Act, but continued to follow the zigzags of the Moscow policy.

of overcoming the present-day shortcomings of capitalism without accepting Communist or Fascist recipes probably escapes their minds.

But in the course of their long career these leaders were taught the lesson that Lenin's theorem as to the transformation of imperialistic wars into civil wars conducive to Communist revolution was not verified by facts. The First World War resulted in the establishment of Communism in Russia, but nowhere else. In the course of the Second War, the tremendous vitality of the great Anglo-Saxon democracies was displayed. The newly gained knowledge has been expressed by the Communist leaders in a significant change in the Doctrine. Today two different types of capitalism are recognized to exist, one progressive, characterized by the liberty of trade unions and at least partial preservation of free competition, another reactionary, characterized by the absence of that liberty and the unrestricted dominance of monopoly capital. Progressive capitalism is now officially treated as the second best form of economic organization, the Communist one being the best, and, more or less explicitly, a long period of coexistence with progressive capitalism is assumed to be ahead.<sup>15</sup>

But, besides the Soviet Union and

the great Anglo-Saxon democracies, there are vast areas devastated by the invaders and, after liberation, subject to strong convulsions on the basis of despair and desire of revenge. In this field, the Soviets and the democracies are in a competitive situation, and one of the peculiar features of this situation is the existence of the Communist parties, former members of the Comintern. These parties are stronger than they ever had been; first of all, their members have played a prominent part in the underground; secondly, today, objective conditions for the rise and spread of Communist ideas exist, stronger here, weaker there.

#### SOVIET FOREIGN POLICY

Relating to these parties, Moscow is in an embarrassing position. These parties see in Moscow a great authority, a group of men victorious both on the Russian scene and in the titanic war of the past few years; and these parties continue to believe in the Marxist Doctrine in a much purer form than the Communists in Moscow do. These parties are naturally inclined to foment trouble in their respective countries. But, from the standpoint of the Moscow leaders, this may be premature. Today, when Russia is almost exhausted by her war effort and the deliberate devastation carried out by the invaders, an overt

<sup>15</sup> The new Doctrine has been formulated by Professor Leontiev and others in an article published in the journal *Under the Banner of Marxism*, August 1943 (in Russian; translated in *American Economic Review*, Sept., 1944). In this country the article has caused an interesting controversy concerning the question whether the Communists had or had not departed from Marxism.

conflict with "progressive capitalism" could hardly appeal to her rulers. On the other hand, entirely abandoning the moral protectorate over the foreign Communist parties would mean abandoning a substantial asset. In consequence, Moscow's policy, in the incipient stage of the period of esoteric internationalism, appears to be full of inconsistencies, now supporting such "reactionary forces" as monarchy in Rumania and Italy, now rebuking the governments of France and Belgium for their attempts to disarm the Forces of Resistance, among them the Communists.

Despite these inconsistencies, the following principles will probably mold the foreign policy of the Soviet Union so long as the esoteric phase of internationalism lasts: (1) national security, on the basis of frontiers considered necessary by military experts; and of the organization of the area west of this frontier on the pattern of a cluster of small States endowed with "pink" governments friendly to the Soviet Union and inclined to far-reaching social reform; (2) gratification of the national sentiment which demands (a) unification, within the Soviet State, of all territories inhabited by Great Russians, Ukrainians the Belorussians and (b) elimination

of all vestiges of defeat and humiliation brought to Russia after, or, more exactly, through the Communist Revolution,<sup>16</sup> and (3) participation in a system of general security provided that the Big Three accept Russia's territorial demands. As a corollary, no direct provocation of Communist Revolution in Europe will probably take place.<sup>17</sup>

If, however, the territorial demands of the Soviet Union are opposed, the esoteric phase of internationalism will be terminated and one of the earlier phases will be revived. The same will probably obtain if the advanced countries do not solve the major problems of the postwar period, those of general security and full employment, and do not help the nations in distress and the backward peoples, especially in Southeastern Europe and Asia, gradually but conspicuously to improve living conditions.

International revolution is not dead, but is rather in a state analogous to anabiosis. Whether "the bacilli of Communism" of which Lenin spoke twenty-five years ago will revive and multiply, depends not so much on the plans and actions of the Moscow leaders, as on the wisdom and energy of the great democracies.

<sup>16</sup> On the territorial demands of the Soviet Union see my article "The Russo-Polish Dispute," *Review of Politics*, April, 1944.

<sup>17</sup> It is interesting to compare Lenin's speech of April 9, 1917, and Thorez' speech of November 30, 1944. The two were delivered by leaders of the respective Communist parties immediately after their return from exile to the fatherland. Lenin's speech directed the Communist Party of Russia to prepare for their Revolution against the Provisional Government and to destroy the army by propaganda. In Thorez' speech, the main point was that France should build up a strong army.

# *Return of the Barbarian*

*Reprinted from CATHOLIC OPINION\**

PEOPLE sometimes talk of the Dark Ages and the barbarians of ancient days. They recall the savage Goths and the fierce creatures of the Stone Age. They always imply, of course, that we have come a great way from our uncouth forbears, that we are the happy inheritors of a great civilization—twentieth century civilization. And yet here and now in this supposedly enlightened era we stand witness to the most awful cruelties ever inflicted by men on their fellow-men. This our day is a day of saturation bombings, buzz-bombs, invisible and inaudible destroyers of human lives, whether those lives be the lives of men, women or children, professional soldiers or helpless invalids, those who live in the dark or those who walk in the light. They call it total war, a new thing on the face of the earth, something of which the men of other days would not have dreamed. Then a man could fight his adversary face to face, which must have been some consolation, but now men kill their fellow-men by radio, by remote control. They fire guns at unseen targets and themselves know not whose hand it was that killed them. Even the great oceans no longer serve as barriers against attack because the rocket projectiles travel on neither land nor sea but in the air, and from these, at least, no man is safe. Theirs is an unheralded approach and a nameless annihilation.

## THE NADIR OF DEGRADATION

Still, all that might possibly be regarded as the legitimate waging of war, where all is supposed to be fair even when it appears to be pretty foul. But if the terrible stories coming out of the concentration camps are true, and they seem to be extraordinarily well authenticated, then human beings have indeed touched the nadir of degradation and barbarism. Even those who have witnessed these things with their own eyes find them difficult to believe and wonder if they have not been subjected to an awful nightmare which has no correspondence with reality. Human lives have been made the playthings of sadistic practices the mere reading of which is nauseating to the average man or woman. New techniques in murder on a mass or an individual scale have been invented and put into operation to satisfy the devilish whims of those

\* 9 Emerald Rd., Kingston, Jamaica, B. W. I., May 6, 1945

to whom torture is a profession, a science, an art, practically their meat and drink. No, this is not the Stone Age; it is the year of grace, 1945.

#### THE NEWS BEHIND THE NEWS

Well, there's the record, and it's pretty frightful, but we might with profit ask ourselves how such things could come to pass. How does it happen that human life can be rated so low, in fact given no rating at all? Why do men treat their fellow-men as they would not treat the dumb beasts of the field or the birds of the air? How can they outrage their own natures so basely? It is very much more important to know the reason why such things are done than to know that they are done. External actions are the offspring of ideas, they mirror forth what things breed within. Could it be that the twentieth century is witness to some of the most shameful chapters in human history because modern man has chosen in great part to rule out God, to be a law unto himself, to join the ranks of that first band of super-men—Lucifer and his fallen angles? We think it could be; we think it is the reason. If men will not serve God, they have no reason for serving their fellow-men. If they do not give God first place, they will give their fellow-men no place at all. If they do not see in their fellow-men the image of God, then whose image shall they see? Today victory is in our grasp, but it is a victory of guns. What we need above all is a victory of ideas, the right ideas over the wrong ones. On that front we can all volunteer for total war.



#### *Socialism and Freedom*

The greatest political thinkers of the last century, men such as de Tocqueville and Lord Acton, warned that Socialism meant slavery, that personal freedom cannot survive the destruction of its base in economic freedom. They were not ranting reactionaries. The early 19th century formulators of Socialist ideology agreed that their ideas were incompatible with freedom. They were proponents of organization, not liberty, and the greatest of them, Count Saint Simon, predicted that those who did not obey his proposed planning boards would be "treated as cattle." Unlike the zealots of planned democracy in our day, he was a clear-headed man.—*Ross Hoffman in THOUGHT, March, 1945.*

# *Alaska, Mission on Top of the World*

JOSEPH F. MACFARLANE, S.J.

*Reprinted from JESUIT MISSIONS\**

**A**LASKANS, conscious of living in a world all their own, one they love and are proud of, speak of the rest of the world as "outside." To "outsiders" there seem to be two Alaskas, one of the whites and one of the Eskimos and Indians. The first they suppose is for adventuresome pioneers, the second for heroic missionaries. But the real Alaska, the one "insiders" love, they hardly know at all.

In 1867, right after the Civil War, Secretary of State, William H. Seward, bought Alaska from Russia for \$7,200,000. You may judge what this country thought of the purchase by the name they gave Alaska—Seward's "Ice Box." Actually history has proven it to be one of the most valuable investments ever made. What the United States acquired was a piece of territory almost as large as all the States east of the Mississippi—600,000 square miles in all stretching east and west across three time zones. To give an idea of what that means, Holy Cross mission in Central Alaska is *west* of the Hawaiian Islands. From north to south it includes a greater range in temperature than is found from Maine to Florida. The Japanese Current, off Alaska's

southern coast, gives a temperate climate averaging about 32°, roughly the same as Seattle, Washington. Mississippi has known colder winters than Sitka, South Alaska. Farther north, winters are severe but Minnesota can be just as cold as Kotzebue, North Alaska.

Winter nights are long but so are the summer days. Newspapers can be read in the streets at midnight in July, and the summer sun works overtime producing giant crops. In the very center of Alaska fifty pound heads of cabbage are raised, and dairy herds supply whole communities with fresh milk. To call Alaska "the land of perpetual snows" is calumny which Alaskans rightfully resent. Father Hubbard, S.J., who has known Alaska for seventeen years, claims that 10,000,000 people could live comfortably on dairy farms alone in Alaska and 30,000,000 more could easily thrive on the other industries which the rich natural resources of the country provide. Actually it has only 73,000 inhabitants.

More than half the country is covered by dense forests of valuable wood, out of which, in a single year, 45,000,000 board feet of lumber were cut. Its Yukon river, 2000 miles

\* 962 Madison Avenue, New York 21, N. Y., April, 1945

long, one of the great rivers of the world, pours more water daily into the Bering Sea than the Mississippi pours into the Gulf of Mexico. Its soil holds coal, silver, lead, mercury, copper, platinum and tin. But the three most valuable sources of wealth in Alaska are fish, gold and fur, in that order. From the original \$7,000,000 investment, already, in thirty-years, \$52,000,000 have been made in seal and walrus, \$500,000,000 worth of gold has been dug from its rivers and mountainsides and over \$1,000,000,000 worth of salmon has been taken from its waters.

#### AN AIR CENTER

The strategic position of Alaska as an air center makes it also a very important spot on this continent. Fairbanks, Alaska, is almost equally distant from New York, Honolulu and Tokyo (about 10 hours); almost equally distant from Moscow, Berlin, London and Chungking (13 hours). If Russia is not to have a complete monopoly on all the postwar flying by the short northern routes to Asia, Alaska will have to be developed as an air center. And, with the coming of the airplane, the whole manner of life in Alaska will change. The only serious obstacle at present to enjoyable, prosperous and progressive living is the slowness and difficulty of traveling. Alaska, therefore, is at least a strategic country, if not our next frontier.

Politically, Alaska is practically an orphan. Its residents have no vote in United States affairs, though they do have a vote in their own. Its one able, well-liked representative in Washington, Hon. Anthony J. Dimond, has no vote (recently he was appointed Judge in the Territory of Alaska). In 1939 Government expenditures for the whole of Alaska were \$3,000,000 but when the Japanese threatened the country, Congress appropriated \$200,000,000 to defend it.

Economically it is a victim of absentee ownership. As far as anyone can see, very little of the enormous profits from its industries and natural resources has been turned back into the country to help its development. In the whole of Alaska, exclusive of Alcan Highway, there are only 2,000 miles of highways and 490 miles of railroads. It has only seven cities with populations of over 1,000. The largest, Juneau, has only 5,748.

For all the wealth of Alaska and for all its vast extent there were only 73,000 people in the whole territory before the war. Of these, about 40,000 were whites mostly from United States and Canada, 20,000 Eskimos, 12,000 Indians and less than 1,000 Japanese, Chinese and Filipinos. The real missionary work is done among the Eskimos and Indians, who differ noticeably from each other in language, culture and temperament. Eskimos live in the North and along the coast and derive their livelihood



from walrus, whale and seal hunting and fishing. Indians live in the interior and subsist, for the most part, on reindeer hunting and fishing.

Eskimos are proud, simple and have an amazingly effective culture. They are not too easily hurt by contact with the white men. Father Hubbard says of them:

There are individuals of high rating in publicity who often speak of the Eskimo as filthy, degenerate, and lacking all semblance of civilization. I wish merely to state that individuals who look for filth and degeneracy and vice can always find it—even in large modern cities. The Eskimos I met all winter were invariably peaceful, clean and with higher standards of religion and morality than I have found anywhere else on earth.

Indians, however, though they made splendid Catholics when isolated in their own familiar environment, have the fatal Indian weakness for the vices of the white men. Eskimos respond more willingly to the appeal of religion, love its ritual and are faithful to the Church. Indians, with some magnificent exceptions, are slow to respond and are prone to negligence. It is chiefly among these two groups that the missionary work has been carried on for almost 150 years.

The Russians were the first whites to discover Alaska and the first to bring Christian influence to Eskimos and the Indians. Missionaries of the Russian Orthodox Church sent some zealous and able priests; most famous of all, Ivan Veniaminof who for thirty years labored among the Aleuts along

the island chain and all down the coast to the Kuskokwim River. He translated portions of the New Testament, composed a catechism and hymnal in the native language, studied their ancient beliefs and superstitions and established a seminary at Sitka for natives. He was later made Bishop of Kamchatka, the Kuriles and Aleutians and finally received the signal honor of being *Metropolitan of Moscow* until his death in 1879. Gradually the Bishopric of Alaska was transferred to San Francisco and the Russian influence steadily declined in Alaska.

Three things hastened the decline. The purchase by the United States with a natural influx of Americans, the haste with which some of the Russian missionaries baptized "converts" without instructions, leaving them pagans in fact and Christians in name only, and the ugly treatment of the people by many of the Russian traders. Today there is practically no Orthodox religious influence in the whole of Alaska.

#### A MOST DIFFICULT MISSION

With the coming of the Americans, missionaries from the United States hastened to the scene—Protestant missionaries. Catholics had more than they could handle with the huge influx of immigrants in the East from Europe, the steadily expanding westward growth of the United States, and the Indian tribes of the uncon-

quered West. To the north, Canada, clear up to the North Pole, was one vast under-manned mission field. Four Oblates of Mary Immaculate, whose successors have made Northern Canada one of the famous mission fields of the Church, from 1862 to 1873, entered Alaska, the first Catholic priests to preach the Faith there: Fathers Seguin, Petitot and Lecorre and Monsignor Clut.

But these were just isolated voyages. Not until Monsignor Seghers (later Archbishop) came in 1877, was there hope for a permanent priest for the territory. He saw it as a full mission field and begged to be sent there for his life's work. There was some delay, during which time he was made Bishop of Victoria, British Columbia, and later transferred to Oregon City. On his first episcopal visit to the Pope, he obtained from Pope Leo XIII re-appointment to Victoria so that he could care for Alaska which was part of his territory. His first step was to obtain Italian Jesuits from the Turin province whose missionaries were already in the Rocky Mountains working among the American Indians under the famous Father Cataldo, S.J., their superior. Two years later, in 1881, just as his work had begun, the venerable Archbishop was murdered by a half-crazed Indian.

But the start had been made and the Church was planted. There were others to carry on the torch. In 1907 French Canadian Jesuits were called

in to assist in the expanding mission field of Alaska. In 1912 the California province of the Jesuits was given charge of Alaska and thus it became an American mission. The early pioneers remained at their posts. Finally, it was assigned to the Oregon province when that was separated from California.

But no one province ever exclusively manned the Alaskan mission. Volunteers have offered themselves for that difficult assignment from France, Spain, Italy, Ireland, Canada and all parts of the United States, ever since the Church established its first foothold there. To this day it has a powerful appeal all over the world to people interested in missions. You will see stories on Alaska in mission magazines from every country in Europe; for in spite of, perhaps because of, its great hardships Alaska is one of the most fascinating missions of the Church.

#### HARD WORK FOR MISSIONARIES

There you have the anomaly of the two Alaskas, an extraordinary country of great wealth, beauty and attraction on one side and on the other, one of the most difficult missions of the world. What makes the missionary work so difficult? Two things—the difficulty of traveling to reach the people and the necessity of travel. For the Indians and Eskimos are hunters and nomadic many months of the year. The fish and fur-bearing

animals come and go in cycles and if the Indians and Eskimos are to have food, they must keep on the move. Now, the missionaries could sit at home in a rather comfortable house with a fairly attractive Church next door, in a comparatively prosperous town, and live a life of relative leisure. But their churches would be empty and the people who need them would be far away like sheep without a shepherd. Their simple mode of life makes it impossible for them to settle in large groups or in cities. They are children of nature and of the wild open spaces. Wherever they go the missionary must go and when they move he moves with them.

The missionary in Alaska, therefore, must be a giant of strength, if possible, but in courage and zeal, of necessity. That they have been, practically without exception, men of such calibre is proven by their record of accomplishment. Today, after less than seventy-five years, more than one-sixth of the people of Alaska, 13,000 of 73,000, are Catholics. Of these, 6,580 are whites, 5,072 are Eskimos and Indians and 1,400 are mixed. To appreciate the magnitude of that task, place the map of Alaska on the map of the United States. Attu would fall at Los Angeles, Dutch Harbor at El Paso, Texas, Anchorage near St. Louis, Nome in South Dakota, Akulurak at the Canadian border, Point Barrow in Canada above Lake Superior, Juneau in North Caro-

lina and Ketchikan just about Charleston, South Carolina. Scatter 73,000 people over a territory that vast and you have some idea of the heroism missionary work in Alaska involves, from the point of view of travel alone. Add to that now the fact that practically all the travel for many months of the year has to be done by dog sled between storms and during storms, and during the rest of the year by boat along the twisting rough rivers, and the simple story of their lives assumes the proportions of an incredible saga.

There is a steady trickle of converts each year, a small, very small, percentage of leakage. As often happens in the mission, the Protestant missionaries can be worse than annoying to the Catholics with their bitter and open anti-Catholic preaching. But this is only a minor grievance and generally ineffectual. Strangely enough, the Quakers who are so friendly here are particularly violent in Alaska. Years of patience and silence and Christian charity are gradually rubbing off the edges of their bitterness and making their opposition subside.

The picture of missionary work in Alaska would be only half told if we were to leave out the Jesuit Brothers and the Sisters. In 1888 three Sisters of St. Ann from Montreal were brought to Juneau. The mission was only just begun. The Italian, priests and Brothers had only just arrived and the welcome given those three hardy pioneer nuns was about as rough as

could be imagined. Yet they stayed and prospered and inspired the long line of brave nuns who have succeeded them. Today there are thirty Sisters of St. Ann.

Others have come to their assistance: the Ursulines who can be found on so many of the difficult missions of the Church, the Sisters of St. Joseph of Newark (N. J.), Sisters of Charity of Providence, the Sisters of Our Lady of the Snows (a native congregation of Eskimo nuns founded by Father John P. Fox, S.J.) and latest to arrive, the Gray Sisters of the Sacred Heart—forty-seven Sisters in all. The story of the Jesuit Brothers cannot be told here but this must be said that without them the mission could hardly have succeeded.

From the beginning the missionaries of Alaska have been motivated entirely by the desire of saving the souls of their scattered people. It is often a lonely work, sometimes a discouraging work. Elsewhere there is a hope some day of gathering immense harvests of souls, developing leaders who will shed lustre on the whole history of the universal Church. Nowhere else on earth is so much human labor expended on so few people and with so little visible results. But when the day comes for each Alaskan missionary to leave his station for the last time and return to his Maker, he will wear a badge of glory, "Missionary in Alaska"—who spent his life on the hardest mission in the world for a handful of people just because they were God's children.

### *A Layman on Prayer*

A famous Spanish diplomat, the Marques de Valdegamas, in a private letter written from Berlin just a century ago, expressed himself thus: "For me, the ideal life is the monastic. I believe that they who pray help the world more than those who fight, and that if the world is going from bad to worse, it is because there are more wars than prayers. Could we penetrate the secrets of God, in my opinion we should remain awe-struck at the sight of prayer's prodigious effects even in human concerns. If society is to have peace, there must be a balance such as God only knows between prayer and action, between the contemplative and the active life. The key to all the disturbances we suffer is possibly the rupture of this equilibrium."

# *The American Society*

MOST REV. BERNARD J. SHEIL, D.D.

IN THE life of every nation there comes an historical moment when that nation must re-evaluate its principles; and, if necessary, re-dedicate itself to that basic ideal which is the true measure of its greatness and the certain condition of its survival. Such a moment has come for the American nation. It is a moment crucial in its implications, not only for us, but for all humanity. In the catastrophic war which scourges our world, and in the social revolution which is rapidly sweeping away most historical landmarks, there is and there shall remain but one basic issue, and that is the cause of human freedom. For this cause the people of this nation have entered the struggle and have taken up the bloody burden of war. It is imperative, then, that we be neither ignorant nor uncertain of what the American ideal is; for it is an ideal in which the historical destiny of this nation was meant to be a model and a hope for the people of the world.

Briefly stated, the social ideal of America is a society of free men: men free to think, to speak, to worship; men free to govern themselves without arbitrary domination by self-appointed political masters; men free to live out their unspectacular lives without the shadow of fear and op-

*Address delivered by the Senior Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago and Founder-Director of The Catholic Youth Organization, April 8, 1945, at Xavier University, Cincinnati, Ohio.*

pression, of want and destitution; men free from any economic strangulation which would make freedom the hollow catch-word of demagogues. This is the American ideal of freedom, a freedom which is the very life-blood of a genuine and organic democratic society. If a democracy does not mean these things, then it is a hypocritical perversion of that word.

Americans seek freedom, not in an access of emotion, nor in the heat of passion, but in a spirit of calm, judicious reasonableness. They seek freedom as the only atmosphere in which the human person can flourish in the manner God intended. Freedom is not a luxury which only the rich and highly placed can afford; it is not merely an adjunct to fine living. It is an absolute condition of life. It is a God-given right; it is not something which a beneficent super-state or a paternalistic government bestows. It belongs as of right to all men and to every man indi-

vidually. Freedom is more than a word. It is a hard, fast reality; it is the very air we breathe. It is the bread on which we are nourished. It is the drink with which we slake our thirst.

The key to the interpretation of the history of America is the persistent struggle to keep alive this ideal of freedom, to vindicate it, and to expand it against every force, external or internal, which would seek to destroy or restrict it. Of its nature the struggle is never-ending, for freedom road allows of no return; nor does it provide any resting place for those who tire on the journey. Each successive generation of Americans must not only protect and consolidate the hard-won gains of the past; it must also move forward by making freedom a vital reality in every sphere of life for ever-increasing numbers of people.

It is the fate of us, the living generation, that we should be called upon to preserve this freedom from the growing threat of totalitarianism, the most powerful single danger to the entire concept of democracy. The choice for the future shall be between democracy and totalitarianism, between a social order based upon human freedom and one founded upon the idea of the state as the complete and unquestioned arbiter of human life. Nor shall the outcome of this war eliminate the necessity for making the choice. On the contrary, the

trend of current political events indicates that the completion of the military phase shall but intensify the urgency of choosing the social order of the future. I repeat: the choice shall be between democracy and totalitarianism.

#### MAN AND THE STATE

Totalitarianism reduces man to the level of matter, a thing of little value. The human person becomes merely an instrument for the State, a plaything, a frightened creature in a world of chaos and swift change. The totalitarian man's highest value lies in the use the State can make of him; he has no higher purpose. His mind, his will, his aspirations belong wholly and totally to the State. If we look upon the brutal face of totalitarianism, we see there the most dangerous threat to its existence that human freedom has ever faced. Inhumanly efficient, it has turned to its use every source of human intelligence and ingenuity. Dedicated to cynical power, it seeks control of all human life; and transforms society from a community of free citizens into an ant-heap. It has ground under the heel of militarism every human emotion, every instinct of decency, every truth and value which raises man above the level of the beast. It has removed man from the center of society and in his place has enshrined a monster—the totalitarian state. Its choicest fruits have been

concentration camps, rotting bodies, smoldering cottages and churches, frustrated hopes and bitter lives.

Unhappily this evaluation of man is not confined to overtly totalitarian regimes. We can find traces of it in some political leaders, more solicitous of power than principle, who give lip-service to democracy, while they ruthlessly violate its underlying bases. And there are suspicions of it in some others, more careful of profit than of person, who use democracy as a cloak for theft and injustice.

In refreshing contrast to this is the Christian evaluation of the human person. Man, Christianity says, is made in the image and likeness of God. All men are brothers under the Fatherhood of God; they call the same God, Father; not my Father, but *Our* Father. Man is redeemed by Jesus Christ; he is a free moral agent, innately superior to all social, economic and political institutions. Man has been created with the capacity for attaining to the vision of truth and of ordering his life by it; he is the measure of all other visible, created things; he is the temporal end to which all things are subordinated, as he is in turn subordinated to his eternal end—God.

We in America believe that our democracy, of all the political systems in the world, is that one which now most closely corresponds to the needs and rights of Christian man. It is based squarely upon the religious

foundations of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Its roots lie deep in the soil of Christianity, so that it is impossible to understand it aright apart from its religious background. Above all, it derives its strength from the Christian belief in the absolute and unique value of the human soul, which transcends all the power and glory of the world. In the Christian democracy, man is the foundation and the end of the State; man is the shaper, the maker, not the tool, of the State. Only at our grave peril can we neglect the religious foundation of any American democracy; for without this foundation, democracy cannot remain itself.

#### THE FOUNDING FATHERS

<sup>12</sup> Although American democracy is a political system, yet it partakes in some way of the nature of a faith. And it engenders a love and a passionate belief that makè it a living, vital thing. And, as a living, vital thing, it must grow and bear fruit; or wither and die. Democracy is not something sterile embalmed in legal documents. Documents may sometimes be used to stifle, rather than promote, personal liberty. There is always a tendency to stabilize the *status quo* by legal devices. But law is not a legalized barrier to the spread of democracy; nor should it be an instrument of special privilege. Laws exist to open the doors to

freedom, to guarantee freedom; not to hem it in, nor to dole it out frugally to those with the proper property qualifications.

There are many who think that democracy is a political system to which nothing can be added. Perhaps they have forgotten that democracy was not a complete product when it came from our revolutionary forebears. The Founding Fathers did not consider it a finished product. They knew that changes would have to be made, and that, while basic principles would remain the same, those principles would have to be adapted to new situations and circumstances. It can truly be said that our history is the story of continual change and a struggle to expand democracy and to extend its benefits to all our citizens. And we are still trying to make our Constitution live up to those promises of freedom and equality set down in our Declaration of Independence.

The Founding Fathers would indeed be horrified if they knew that the Constitution was being used today by certain groups and individuals as a cloak for injustice and undemocratic action. They would raise a questioning eye-brow at the peculiar circumstances in which the word "democracy" is often found. They might be sickened at the wordy devotion to democracy on the part of some of our most prominently anti-democratic citizens. They would be puzzled by

the constant invocation of their names on the part of men and groups who are most violently opposed to the spread of American democracy and its benefits to any considerable number of people. They might be irritated by the constant warnings of ultimate disaster for the country unless the wishes of selfish egomaniacs are followed and fulfilled. Too many defenders of the so-called "American Way" identify this American Way with a program of greed and privilege.

The Founding Fathers knew that they were leaving democracy with some unfinished business. It is up to us to finish that business. High on the list of unfinished business is the American Negro. It is obvious, but unpleasant, to say that the Negro is oppressed economically, stifled socially and ignored politically in America. This is a brutal truth; its brutality does not lessen, rather, it emphasizes the truth. The Negro has not received a square deal, an honest deal, or a new deal from white America. Times without number, he has been denied a job simply because he was black. He is not accepted on an equal plane in the drawing-rooms of the white group. In some parts of the country, his vote is side-tracked by legal tricks. The Negro is denied entrance to many of our educational institutions. Some of these, unhappily, are Catholic. Even where separate educational facilities are provided, the Negro receives second-rate equipment



and teaching. He is pushed into undesirable living quarters, frequently indescribably filthy and unfit for human habitation. How long are we going to continue to give second-class privileges to first-class citizens.

#### ANTI-SEMITISM

Another portion of the unfinished business of democracy is the elimination of anti-Semitism. It is one of the ironies of this war that anti-Semitism has grown alarmingly in our country. The Jew is misrepresented by the concentrated and deadly persistence of his haters. Anti-Semitism has no rational validity. Yet, conceived in iniquity and brought forth in fear, it possesses great emotional force, because it thrives on ignorance and is nourished by hatred. The only Jew the gentile need fear is the imaginary one he has created in his own mind.

A world is drenched in blood and flooded with bitterness, at least in part because of the inhuman racial practices of Hitler and his cohorts. Yet we who do battle for the preservation of man's dignity frustrate and nullify here at home what we fight for abroad. While our army and navy struggle and fight and die for human liberty and dignity on the battle-fields of the world, we stifle and deny it to millions of our fellow citizens. Prejudice against other men is the antithesis of all the things we in America hold dear; it rends the solidarity of the

human race and makes a mockery of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. It is the negation of that Christian spirit which is the matrix of democracy. One thing is sure: American democracy will never be a reality for all of us until this vicious and festering sore of racism is removed from our national and individual lives.

At this point it is appropriate to say that the present agitation to make the Fair Employment Practice Committee permanent is a most hopeful portent for the future of American democracy. It is motivated by the most democratic spirit of the times, and it should receive the active support of all right-minded citizens. It is an attempt through legislation to make the equality of all men more than a phrase in the Declaration of Independence. Its objective is to acknowledge man's dignity by providing him with the means for his economic emancipation.

Unfortunately, there are people in America who deliberately encourage the rise of racism, by fostering these base prejudices and fanning the flames of race feeling. This they do for several reasons, not the least of which is economic. They tell us that, unless we encourage discrimination against minority groups, "white gentiles will be driven entirely from the business world, and from the professions, as well as from public life." These last words are taken verbatim

from the Congressional Record: they were delivered by one of the leading political figures of the day. Such a quotation serves to help us see more clearly the forces which are working to prevent a fuller expression of our democracy in the nation's economic structure.

#### SOUND ECONOMIC SYSTEM

18 But the sharpest criticism of democracy, and most of the charges that it is decadent, are based on its failures on the economic level. Our failure to secure a decent economic well-being for all our people has been used by the enemies of American democracy as a reason for rejecting all democratic ideals. This is a matter of central concern to the success of the American society.

It is no exaggeration to say that our American democracy cannot exist unless our economic system is healthy and flourishing, providing equal opportunities for all of us. It is not enough to say that all men are created equal, with equal rights to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. No matter how passionately we may believe in these things, our belief will avail little, unless we implement these truths by effective action, so that they may become fruitful realities for all. For too long, and for too many people, they have been but handy phrases for Fourth-of-July oratory.

We expect of our American society that opportunity will be offered

for the securing of means necessary to the maintaining of life: the acquisition of food, clothing and shelter. The primary purpose of any economic system is to provide men with the means to a livelihood. In the economic system, as in other things which touch the human being, it is the human person who is the key, the guide, the measure. There is, then, only one standard by which to judge a given system of economy: how well does it fulfil its purpose; how well does it secure the economic well-being of men? This is the only true and humane standard: it must be applied ruthlessly. All other considerations, whether of profit or power, are secondary. An economic system is good only insofar as it approaches the fulfilment of the purpose for which it exists: to provide men with the means to life.

Private property still remains as the one essential to that economic security which allows man to achieve the end for which he was placed in this world: his eternal salvation through those temporal things which God has placed at his disposal. Man must have economic freedom if he is to make a worthy contribution to society. Political freedom without a corresponding economic freedom is an empty slogan.

But capitalistic industrialism and socialism have destroyed the old personal and individual conception of private property by mechanizing and de-personalizing this economic basis

of social life. As conceived by many of its proponents, capitalism has but one purpose: the making of profits for shareholders. They ignore the principle that the primary purpose of our industrial economy is to provide men with the means to sustain life. When this is pointed out, many of them cry out in protest about the danger of Communism. They forget, or they do not wish to remember, that Communism is never a threat where social justice prevails; and where adequate and Christian social reform exists. In the words of Pius XI: "It is impossible to care for the social organism and the good of society unless each single part and each individual member, i.e., each man in the dignity of his human personality, is supplied with everything that is necessary for the exercise of his social functions."

But the economic system is not the be-all and the end-all of life. It is of tremendous importance, but its importance derives primarily from the fact that it is a means to an end: which is to help man reach God. It is only too true that economic want militates against human well-being, and fills men with harassing preoccupations and anxieties. It seriously hampers his efforts toward achieving his union with God. There are exceptions, but for the majority of mankind the consequences of material want are stunted lives and stunted souls. The continual fear and uncertainty of those whose daily

bread is insecure impedes the growth of the soul. The most searing and crippling effects of economic insecurity are not in the bodies, but in the souls, of men.

#### CAPITAL AND LABOR

24 Certainly, as a part of the economic world in which we operate, the labor union has come to occupy a large place. The necessity for labor organizations and the necessity for collective bargaining need no longer be argued, except in the case of a minority of blind and stubborn demagogues and economic royalists. It is futile to argue with such men, since they live in a world that died long ago. The labor union as a bargaining unit is an accepted and permanent force in American society; but I believe that the labor union, in economic democracy, must become more than an agency which arbitrates on hours and wages; it must enter intimately into the economic well-springs of our life. The labor union, as a recognized social and economic force, must have a voice, along with capital, in the management of industry.

The time is long since passed when labor will be satisfied with what is left over. Pius XI has said: "Unless the various forms of human endeavor, dependent one upon the other, are united in mutual harmony and mutual support; unless, above all, capital and labor combine together for common effort, man's toil cannot

produce due fruit." True economic democracy must provide for a share in both ownership and profits on the part of labor. In this connection, we read in the statement of the American Hierarchy (1940): "... a contract between employers and employees would serve the purpose of individual and social welfare most effectively if it were modified by some form of partnership which would permit a graduated share in the ownership and profits of business and also some voice in its management."

And it is paramount for the economic future of the nation that labor unions, together with the government and industry, work untiringly toward the establishment of the annual wage for American workers. The results of such an effort in stabilizing family life and increasing prosperity would be of incalculable value to the nation. Some assert that the annual wage is a dream of cloud-capped visionaries and impractical planners. This assertion comes to nothing in view of the resounding success of the annual wage plans in several prominent American industries.

These are some of the things American democracy must work upon, if the American ideal is to become real. But it is sheer fantasy to think that such a society can exist in America alone; or that such a society can be pursued by an America indifferent to the rest of the world. Our social ideal cannot be confined only to those

who dwell within the borders of this country. For the American ideal contains no narrow isolationist spirit; it expresses no hint of that type of national selfishness which denies the basic unity and the universal brotherhood of man. Isolation is physically impossible, because the world has become small and nations are interdependent. The air age is here, and there are no distant points. But more, isolation for America, as for all nations, is morally and spiritually impossible, unless we are prepared to ignore very fundamental Christian concepts of mankind and the world. Christianity tells us that men are united under the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. The bonds of this union are inviolable and its consequences unavoidable.

78

## INTERNATIONALISM

Very concretely, this means that we cannot look with cold unconcern on the suffering and distress of other men anywhere in the world. If we are free, we cannot rest until other men are released from their bondage. If we enjoy the fruits of justice, we cannot ignore the oppression of our brothers. If we are secure, we must work to achieve that same security for our brothers everywhere. The obligations of Christian justice and charity utterly preclude any policy of indifference. Christian ideals of freedom and justice, as of salvation, are essentially social. For the Christian,

therefore, freedom, justice and peace are indivisible. If these things are threatened anywhere, they are threatened everywhere. The basis of our unity with others is not a matter of political opinions; it is our resistance to an inhuman system which is opposed to everything that Christian men hold dear.

All the harrowing events of our time point inexorably to the necessity of international cooperation. But the international family of nations already exists; so it is not a question of creating an international community, but rather of organizing it. As Christopher Dawson has so clearly said: "... the catastrophic history of the last thirty years, with its two world wars, and its succession of political and economic crises ought to supply enough proof to convince the most cautious and conservative mind that the question of world order is not a utopian speculation but a vital issue on which our own lives and the existence of our civilization depend." Events of the past years have made the arguments for or against internationalism largely academic.

We have at hand the means of implementing this international community, principally in the proposals of Bretton Woods and Dumbarton Oaks. It is no exaggeration to say that Bretton Woods marks the first major development in the direction of actual international economic col-

laboration. If America abstains from participation, or if America emasculates these proposals, then it is certain that economic collaboration will collapse. Bretton Woods offers a concrete way of preventing universal economic conflict with its resultant poverty, international distrust, suspicion and hatred. As a prominent American editor has said: "The time has come to take an affirmative step in good faith, or else to fail in the first real test of our sincerity."

By all means, let us look at Dumbarton Oaks realistically. It may be imperfect, but it is the best that can be obtained under the circumstances, in a very troubled world. With this proposed organization there is at least a chance of doing something about the persistent problem of imperialism and political peonage; without it, there is none. If we do not have world order, then assuredly we shall have world anarchy. It is folly to disrupt the prevailing unity among the United Nations by emotional outbursts and reckless denunciation. Let us not be among those unrealistic perfectionists who will not take the first step because the second step will not bring them immediately into Utopia. Dumbarton Oaks gives us a chance to fight for a new dignity and authority for true international law, which alone is capable of giving us a stable and just peace. It offers us an opportunity to fight concessions to the rule of might over right: and

to settle those grievances which rankle in the bosoms of aggrieved nations, without resort to war.

Unless the people of America are willing to support these proposals and help make them work, they are no more than words. We cannot remain indifferent or uninformed, if we wish to avoid a bad peace. If we are alert, informed and articulate, we can strip ourselves of distrust and hatred, of expediency and national greed.

32

#### UNITY OF ALL NATIONS

If there is any lesson to be learned today, it is the lesson of unity, the unity of all peoples and all nations. The will of the people must be welded into a solid bulwark with a common faith and a common goal. This is the time for every man to renounce the thoughts of his petty little problems, of gain, of comfort, of self-gratification. This is the time to join ourselves to the great current which is approaching to sweep us all, willing or unwilling, into the future. We can consciously participate in the making of the future, or we shall mutely and unwillingly be swept along in the current of history.

For American Catholics especially, this is a time of unexcelled opportunity. Swift and radical transformations are being made in all spheres of life. Far-reaching and devastating changes are on the way. The Catholic Church possesses a body of

social doctrine that is more radical, more sweeping than anything proposed by any other group; a proof again that the Church is not a silent witness to forgotten truth, but stands at the very heart of the struggle. Nothing said or done so far by any individual or groups has approximated the goal which the Popes and the American Bishops have set down for those engaged in bringing about economic and social reform. Yet, we Catholics individually have been largely indifferent in voicing these truths. We must realize that the Popes and Bishops were not merely indulging themselves rhetorically. They were pronouncing quite seriously the social doctrine of our Church on matters of the greatest import to the world at large. They meant that we were to do something about these questions: and they were offering us guidance, the surest and wisest guidance possible.

It does not suffice for us Catholics to proclaim loudly that we possess the truth, and then limit ourselves to negative criticism of what non-Catholics are doing. This policy of abstention is worse than useless. Let us remember that a radical social transformation is inevitable. The only question for us is: shall it be achieved with us or without us? If it is achieved without us, that achievement will not be based upon the secure foundation of social truth.

There is a mighty tide of suffering

in the world today. Catholics can have a great and honorable part in alleviating it; and can make an enormous contribution, in union with their fellow citizens, to a finer America and a better world. It is up to us, with all other men, to see that the world emerges from the present conflict into a new and truly Christian age, where the human being, in suffering and hope, will resume his

journey toward freedom, and will once again step firmly on the road to eternal salvation.

With firm faith in the Christian concept of democracy, with high hope for the future of mankind, with true charity for all men in our hearts, let us move toward the establishment of that American society, the ideal of freedom-loving people everywhere.



### *No Soviet "Democracy"*

We hope the British representatives are not leaving any doubt in Moscow that the Western world can very well distinguish between free institutions and pseudo-free institutions; that there are certain tests, like the freedom of the press, domestic and foreign, to travel, question and report, which show very well whether a country enjoys freedom or not. What we cannot accept for Central Europe is a repetition of the line of argument constantly advanced to explain the absence of these essential freedoms inside Soviet Russia: the argument that this is a period of revolutionary transition, necessarily violent, necessarily lived under military discipline, in order to establish a firm foundation of a material prosperity from which all other good things will eventually flow. The countries of Central Europe are in no need of violent revolution, and think of it with such repugnance that assurances have had to be given to them that no violent overturning of their institutions is planned. The tactics revolutionaries have to follow is the best disproof of their democratic claims. They are forcing unwanted medicine and operations without daring to avow their full plans.—THE TABLET (*London*), October 21, 1944.

## THE EDITORIAL MIND

### *Blatant Discrimination*

**C**ATHOLICS constitute between one-sixth and one-fifth of the population of the United States. Since most of them are located in large cities where the per capita income is higher than the average for the nation, they pay at least from one-sixth to one-fifth of the taxes.

The Catholic citizens of this nation conduct over 10,000 elementary and secondary or high schools, attended by 2,399,908 children. Like all other schools, they experienced the financial burden placed on education institutions before the war, and accentuated since Pearl Harbor.

Influential members of Congress have decided that the schools of the nation need assistance. The Senate has before it a measure providing for such assistance. But the bill stipulates that "the funds paid to a state under this act shall be expended only by public agencies and under public control."

There is no evil in the country more widely discussed and more properly denounced than discrimination on racial or religious grounds. But here is a proposal which would bar over two and a quarter millions of children from participation in a public fund because the consciences of Cath-

olics require them to give their children a religious education.

Catholic educators are opposed to Federal aid for schools as a general practice because they are convinced that Federal aid will bring Federal control, and thus make our educational system a convenient channel for the philosophies of the school of thought which happens to be in control; they would condone it only when it is evident that the local resources are demonstrably insufficient to meet the minimum educational requirements. But under any system of Federal aid, to bar Catholic and other religious schools from participating in funds contributed in large part by those supporting these schools is discriminatory, undemocratic and unfair.—THE CATHOLIC NEWS, *New York, N. Y., February 24, 1945.*

### *Catholics Not Wanted*

**A** FEW months ago a writer for a Protestant publication wrote a series of articles in an effort to show that the Catholic Church is winning America. If the Catholic Church does achieve such a victory, it will be strictly spiritual, for which, perhaps, we may thank Heaven.



For in the long and varied history of this country, exactly eight Catholics have been in a Presidential cabinet, three of these having served since 1933. Two of the three, James A. Farley and Postmaster Frank C. Walker, served the Post-Office Department, which can hardly be considered a major policy-making division of government. The third member was former Attorney General Frank Murphy, now on the Supreme Court. One other Catholic, former Senator Thomas J. Walsh, had been slated for attorney general, but he died before taking office.

The Catholic record on the Supreme Court is even less impressive. While there is now a Catholic Justice, there is only one, and only one other, the late Justice Butler, has served in recent years. In the whole history of the nation, only about a half dozen Catholics have been named to the highest bench. Incidentally, there are eleven cabinet positions and nine seats on the Supreme Court to be filled.

It may be possible, but it seems hardly likely, that there are at all times so few Catholics qualified for these high offices. Catholics constitute about one-sixth the population; their patriotic record is unquestioned; their preparation, thanks to the vast parochial school and Catholic college system, is adequate. Catholics have distinguished themselves in all fields of honorable endeavor; indeed, Catholics

have been accepted as national leaders in politics.

Why Catholics fail to gain more cabinet and court positions, why there are so few Catholic ambassadors, and why Catholics are generally given minor jobs, if anything, is a matter for reflection. Everyone knows the fate of the Catholic who ran for President; he was defeated soundly on the "wet" issue by a nation which, at its first opportunity, completely repudiated prohibition. If it is bigotry, even of a majority, that is keeping Catholics out of the cabinet and court, then a leader must come who will fly in the face of that bigotry and set the example of tolerance for the future.—THE PROVIDENCE VISITOR, *Providence, R. I., April 19, 1945.*

### *Jehovah Witnesses*

WITH the coming of spring the Jehovah Witnesses are again on the warpath. They have come out of hibernation and are on the highways and the byways preaching their peculiar interpretation of the word of God and distributing their pamphlets and journals.

Several of their writings are an insane mess and hodgepodge; a conglomeration of silly, stupid nonsense and hatred. There are so many contradictions and untruths that it would be utter folly to try to unravel them. It would be doubly so since we know

from personal dealings with them that the Jehovahs have not even the most elemental knowledge of any rules of logic and can murder Bible quotations to suit any purpose.

It is enough to say of this group in the words of Our Lord: "They are blind and leaders of the blind."

"By their works you shall know them," Our Saviour tells us. Hatred, discord, lying in its vilest form, vituperation and unjust condemnation are the works of members of this group of religious fanatics, just as exclusively as they are the works of the devil himself.

The hatred of these religious fanatics for Catholics is bitter and intense, yet the Bible they always tote with them and which they claim is "the inspired word" tells them, "Thou shall love thy neighbor as thyself." Everybody but a Catholic is their neighbor.

They resent being called liars, yet their Bible says, "If any man says that he love God and at the same time hates his neighbor that man is a liar."

To ask any member of this group from what source they received the Bible they use, or how they interpret the Eighth Commandment, "Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor" in its relation to Catholics, is the equivalent of asking a first-grade child to explain the Einstein theory. They have not the faintest idea.

Excuse us for quoting Barnum in

the same few words in which we quote Our Saviour, but Barnum must have had the Witnesses in mind when he said: "There's a sucker born every minute."

As Christ on the cross prayed for those crucifying Him, we, too, using His words, pray now for these deluded human beings who are crucifying us with their gospel of hate and untruth: "Father, forgive them for they know not what they do."—THE CATHOLIC LIGHT, Scranton, Pa., April 20, 1945.

### *Black Marketeers*

IT IS a truism that there can be no black markets without black market purchasers. It follows, then, that the key to control of black marketeering lies in public cooperation. The basis of this must be a general recognition that black market buying is an ugly form of sabotage. If half a dozen men were adrift together in a lifeboat and one of them drank more than his fair share of the scarce supply of water, it is obvious that he would be endangering the lives of his fellow castaways. People who defy the rationing and price-control laws at home to get more than their fair share of scarce food supplies menace the safety and well-being of their fellow citizens in precisely the same way. They deserve exposure, contempt and punishment.

Black markets, it is worth remembering, are not labeled as such. They

are not necessarily hideaways and speakeasies, but may exist in the most open and respectable of retail establishments. And the black marketeers, similarly, may often be quite reputable housewives who would blanch at forgery or arson or embezzlement, yet do not scruple to pay a bit more than the ceiling price to get a few delicacies for their dinner tables. They operate deviously, often blinking their eyes at their own violations, pretending to themselves that they are quite decent, law-abiding citizens. All the same, they are engaging in a peculiarly mean and dangerous form of stealing.

For black marketeering is contagious. Those who indulge in it tend to corrupt not only the merchants from whom they buy but their friends and neighbors as well, who condone their own violations on the specious ground that "everybody's doing it."

If "everybody" gets to doing it, we are quite likely to have widespread suffering in America, particularly in respect to food. For while there is enough food to go around and to afford high nutritional standards for all, if it is equitably distributed, there is not enough food to permit the hogging of it by favored persons. The OPA can be counted upon to do what it can toward enforcement of the law. But it has been limited by Congress in the means of enforcement. And, in any case, it cannot force the American people to observe a morality to which they do not subscribe. It can effect a fair distribution of our scarce supplies only if the public insists upon such a distribution and assists in bringing it about. And that means treating all black market buyers as the sordid criminals they are.—WASHINGTON Post, May 15, 1945.



### *Morning Offerings*

Not many are called to the prayerful quiet of a contemplative life nor does God desire us to relinquish the responsibilities of our state of life to devote ourselves to continued prayer and penance, but all are called to serve God in the circumstances in which they are placed. We all can carry out this total consecration to the Sacred Heart; we all can live lives of reparative love in the humdrum activities of our daily life by making use of the first of those aids which the Apostleship of Prayer puts at our disposal, the "Morning Offering."—*John C. McAstocker, S. J., in THE JESUIT SEMINARY NEWS, November, 1944.*

# The Priest and Social Action

REV. JOHN F. CRONIN, S.S.

Reprinted from THE VOICE\*

MANY and eloquent have been the pleas for the parish priest to interest himself in social action. The late Holy Father, Pope Pius XI, addressed to the clergy fervent exhortations to take up the cause of social justice. He felt that thus alone could the structure of civilization be saved from the menace of Communism and of the dictator-state. More recently, the present Supreme Pontiff, in his message of September 1, 1944, stated that the social problem is the primary question of world reconstruction. He voiced his fears of Communism. Equally strong was his anxiety lest concentration of power and exploitation of the weak under unregulated capitalism should drive desperate men to extreme solutions.

The parish clergy are most anxious to respond to the call from Rome. Burdened as they are with extraordinary duties occasioned by the war, they nonetheless realize that these great problems will not await our convenience. Tomorrow may be too late. Prudent and wise action in time may head off serious evils. But the average priest finds many an obstacle between will to act and the means of execution. He is bewildered at grandiose schemes proposed in books and

feels utterly incapable of putting them into action.

This article was written in the hope of suggesting a practical plan which could be carried out in most dioceses. To start with, we must distinguish between three levels of Catholic social action: the national, the diocesan and the parish. On national issues the official body is, of course, the Social Action Department of the National Catholic Welfare Conference. This department is headed by Bishop Alter, of Toledo, and a permanent staff which includes Monsignor Ryan and a corps of able assistants. This body represents the Church at legislative hearings and gives direct assistance to the various bishops throughout the country. It serves as a clearinghouse for information on social action, and stimulates and encourages many valuable projects. Advice and assistance is always cheerfully given. One valuable service is a mimeographed bulletin entitled *Social Action Notes for Priests*. It can be had gratis by writing to its extremely competent present editor, Rev. Dr. George Higgins, at the N.C.W.C. in Washington.

With such representation, there is no need for the average priest to feel discouraged at the intricacies of na-

\* St. Mary's Seminary, Roland Park, Baltimore 10, Md., November, 1944.

tional economic problems. Whatever be his private opinions on taxation, corporation problems, labor law and policy, it is not his responsibility to pass public judgment or to initiate changes on this level. His work in social action will be helped by an understanding of these matters, but such understanding is not indispensable. An immense amount of good can be done, even if every diocese does not possess a dozen Ph.D.'s in economics. It is only natural that a prudent man will avoid public discussions of such matters when he has not had the chance to study them. But such self-limitation will not prevent him from doing excellent work. Indeed, it may prevent mistakes which would hinder the execution of all-important, if less ambitious plans. As a matter of fact, European experience shows that the best work is done from the bottom up, not from the top down.

#### DIOCESAN SOCIAL ACTION

The second level of social action is diocesan. Some dioceses have full-time social action directors aided by a committee chosen from different regions of the diocese. Detroit, Hartford and San Antonio come to mind in this connection. Men working at this level do not need to be experts in their field, although formal training is highly helpful. Committees of this sort come about in many ways. Usually some outside stimulus to social action is invoked by the Bishop. This

could be a Catholic Industrial Conference, a social action school for priests, or even a one-day conference by some priest with extensive experience in the field. As a result of this stimulus, the Bishop soon discovers who is interested in, and temperamentally fitted for, social action. Four or five priests who have shown prudence and zeal in the work are usually enough for a committee.

Anyone who has worked some time in this field soon feels the need for some specialized training. Not many priests, however, would have the occasion to get a University degree in the field. For the overwhelming majority, an excellent opportunity is offered through the Institute of Catholic Social Studies, which offers a six-weeks summer course at the Catholic University. The Institute was founded in 1941 for this exclusive purpose. A three-summer course is offered, but one summer only has been found quite helpful. Washington has special advantages in governmental and labor contacts. Indeed, most of the priests who attended felt that half their training was received through this medium. Another Institute of this type, with a still more ambitious program, has been opened at St. Louis University by the Jesuit Fathers.

The third, and in many ways the most important, level is parish. It is the parish priest who has the opportunity to give talks on Catholic social teaching, to make contacts with labor

groups and business men, and even, when opportunity offers, to initiate concrete projects, such as credit unions, co-operatives, Catholic Action cells, and the like. It is from these activities that really vigorous diocesan programs spring.

A priest who is interested in social action will find that three stages of development suggest themselves. In the first place, he will feel the need of self-education. This involves both principles and facts. Principles, of course, can be found in the great social encyclicals of the recent popes. Three are particularly useful: *Rerum Novarum* of Leo XIII, and *Quadragesimo Anno* and *Atheistic Communism* of Pius XI. Incidentally, the first two should be read in the new and more accurate translation recently published by the N.C.W.C. In addition, there are many valuable pamphlets available, particularly the Social Action series published jointly by the N.C.W.C. and the Paulist Press. Valuable reading hints are found in Fr. Higin's notes, mentioned earlier. Others can be found in the present writer's *Economics and Society* (American Book Company). In a few years, it is hoped, the courses on Catholic Principles, Catholic Social Action, and History of Catholic Social Thought, given at the Institute of Catholic Social Studies, will be available for general circulation.

As to facts, it must be confessed that neither the press nor the radio

is a reliable source of information on controversial issues. *The New York Times* seems to be the best general newspaper, but specialized material is needed to supplement it. This writer would recommend *Labor* (10 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D. C., \$1.00) as a general paper on labor matters, and the *Wage Earner* (338 State St., Detroit 26, \$1.00) as an excellent Catholic paper. Both *America* and the *Commonweal* have good articles in the field, with *America* favored. The Public Affairs pamphlets (Rockefeller Center, N. Y. C.) are worth subscribing to, and, among the more elaborate magazines, *Fortune* is usually good.

Perhaps the most valuable type of self-education will come from working in the field. Much can be gotten by direct contact with workers and labor leaders, business men and government officials. But in so far as we are to lead and not merely to accompany or follow others, something beyond this is generally required.

Self-education is a preliminary to education of others. This can be done through parish talks (preferably in addition to occasional Sunday sermons), Catholic radio programs, study clubs, and specialized classes. Talks can be given to various parish and diocesan societies. Lecture courses and forums by outside speakers can be arranged. It would be an excellent idea to see that teachers in our schools are aware of Catholic principles in the

social field. They have an outstanding opportunity to train apostles of Catholic action. We do not need to restrict our education to those of the faith. Service clubs, such as Rotary, Kiwanis, and the like, are always on the lookout for speakers. Our principles, clothed in language they can understand, are usually well received. Perhaps a diocesan speakers bureau could be organized, with different priests specializing in certain phases of Catholic social thought.

#### WORKERS' SCHOOLS

Among the forums appealing to definite groups are the Church-Industry meetings sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, and workers' schools initiated by diocesan committees or local priests. Some of the clergy are suspicious that the Church-Industry meetings were initiated for propaganda purposes. Indeed, labor is projecting a similar series to counteract the supposed bias. Regardless of motives, however, these meetings afford contacts which can be used by alert priests to put across Catholic principles. Thus with both groups we could favor cooperation rather than class struggle; we could insist upon social responsibility as well as individual rights; by knowing both we could act as mediators to bring them together and thus instill mutual trust.

Workers' schools have been successful in many dioceses. Their pur-

pose is to train workers in Catholic principles and also in the tools needed to make these principles known. These tools consist in some knowledge of labor problems and policies and in parliamentary law and public speaking, so that ideas can be effectively expressed. Usually the labor school program consists of many elementary schools in various parishes and a central school with expert teachers from nearby colleges to give more advanced courses. This type of training was recommended by Pope Pius XI.

A somewhat different approach is the Catholic Action cell program, based on the remarkable Jocist movement in Belgium and France. Behind this movement is the philosophy of intensive rather than extensive training. The idea is to discover potential leadership material and to inspire these men and women to be apostles to others in their community. The Jocist observes the problems of his environment, studies the Christian solution to them, and carries this into action. He will find that living an intense, courageous Christian life himself is the best way to influence others. Soon other courageous souls associate themselves with him and a cell is born. When enough cells in any environment (workers, professional men, students, farmers, etc.) are formed, they federate and undertake joint programs. Ultimately such movements could become city-wide, diocesan and national.

Such a development in France was characterized by Pope Pius XI as Pentecostal. Incidentally, in such programs, the priest is supposed to guide and inspire, but not to dominate. The Pope prefers that we train and educate the laity, but that they should carry programs into action. In doing this they should be subject to the general control of the clergy, but not to immediate and detailed direction. (Literature on Catholic Social Action of this type can be obtained through the Newman Book Shop, Westminster, Md.)

In addition to formal education, the priest can have great informal and indirect influence upon different social groups. In most cases the easiest approach is to labor. (We are not considering here rural social action. This would require a separate article, better written by one with direct experience in the work.) Labor problems are likely to be critical in the years to come. They involve many questions of justice. In the past, most of these revolved around injustice to the worker on the part of capital. Many of these problems still persist. Starvation wages are not common at the moment, but mistreatment in the matter of working conditions and grievance procedure is a frequent subject of complaint. Today, however, there are also injustices towards the worker by their fellow workers. Many problems arise within unions where the help of a priest is

welcomed. Then, regardless of particular questions, there is the over-all Catholic objective of replacing class strife by harmony and cooperation. In seeking this, it is easier to start at the labor end.

Attitude is very important in this field. A priest must be rigorously just to be respected and influential. The Pope instructs us to "go to the workingman" and to be a friend of labor. But this is something other than being a labor priest in the sense of "labor, right or wrong." We gain nothing by indiscriminate allegiance which winks at injustice. On the other hand, impartiality does not mean the too frequent habit of throwing a carefully measured quantity of bouquets and bricks in equal amounts at capital and labor. Nor it is expressed by the "I am in favor of labor unions, but" attitude.

Actually the phrase "capital and labor" expresses an unreal generalization. What really exist are business men and laboring men, individuals no better and no worse than the public as a whole. There are good and bad labor leaders and good and bad business men. Those who have had actual experience in the field are convinced that the good outweigh the bad in both groups. Thus, justice may demand in one circumstance that we be wholly pro-labor in some cases and equally pro-capital in others. Of course, the fact that capital has better access to publicity channels does lead



many, out of a sense of justice, to present the other side of the picture. A priest could thus get a reputation of being biased in favor of labor. But if really informed persons of both sides know the truth, his influence will be unimpaired.

#### THE PRIEST AND LABOR

Actual contact with the labor movement is easily had. Frequently this can be obtained through parishioners. If this is not feasible, other techniques can be used. Labor leaders are usually flattered when invited to speak to a parish group. Little favors, such as speaking at special meetings, often bring fruitful results. Of course if a priest can help in an organizational drive, with prior permission or toleration by his bishop, then his career is made. After that it is simply a matter of growing in contacts and friendliness. Often this will develop into opportunities for mediation and arbitration. Fairness and good sense under these circumstances give one a better approach to capital than would more direct methods. Once this stage is reached, the problem is not to find what to do, but simply to recruit helpers so that the job can be done. A priest who is "on the inside" of the labor movement is able to give effective leadership in accord with Christian principles. Advice and even criticism from friends is accepted, while the same comment from strangers would be resented.

While the direct purpose of these activities is the practice of justice and the safeguarding of Christian society, it is surprising how great are the indirect gains of the Church. Catholic workers take a new pride in the Church when the priest is their champion and defender in this important segment of their lives. Protestants and Jews acquire a friendliness which could easily be the prelude, with God's grace, to conversion. It is touching when these non-Catholics come to the priest for advice and guidance in family and personal matters. It is heart-warming when some lax Catholic tells you that he returned to the Sacraments because of your labor ministrations. The truths of our Church are so great that we feel that once men really know them, they can not but wish to believe. Here is an unique opportunity to win men's hearts and to cultivate the dispositions which are the psychological prelude to the great gift of faith. Not everyone is fitted by temperament for this work, but to those who are thus inclined, a wide door awaits to be opened.

There are many points which were left untouched. Youth work, work with special racial groups, with the unemployed, with seamen and others having unusual problems, retreats to workers, and columns in secular newspapers and diocesan weeklies are but some of the possible phases of Catholic social action. But the important

thing is to make a start. Once a priest is active in the work, his interests will expand and his insight will be deepened. Consultation and organization will naturally follow. Then America can expect a golden

era of social action, such as glorified the Church in Holland, Belgium, France and Germany before the blight of war and totalitarianism withered these fair and promising fruits of our holy Faith.



### *Chain Prayers*

The latest burlesque of the chain letter is the superstitious practice advocated by some overly religious-minded individuals who hope to storm Heaven by a chain letter of prayers. Modelled after the dime-a-letter-chain-make-several-copies-send-them-on-to-your-friends idea, this new concoction calls for so many prayers, for so many days, in an unbroken chain; otherwise that for which you ask will not be granted.

For anyone to place his hopes of supernatural aid in a letter, whether that letter be in a chain or not in a chain, is tantamount to childish, superstitious foolishness smacking of hobgoblins and monstrous beasts that were once used to frighten children into being good.—THE SOUTHERN CROSS, December 29, 1944.

### *A Point of View*

We must tackle the problem of Catholic education. At present education in the democracies too often destroys the social conscience of the citizen. The Catholic idea that society is a co-operating unit of men, each with his own duties and rights, should be the very center of our education. Frankly, I feel I have learned more from my spare-time reading of Catholic philosophy than from any school I ever attended. Modern colleges prepare a man for a "career," and a "career" in the modern meaning of the word means that you are trying continually to be better than the other fellow instead of trying to live with your fellow citizens.—Martin Kyne, Executive Vice-President of the United Retail, Wholesale and Department Employes of America, quoted in the LONDON CATHOLIC HERALD.

# Training The Child

FR. LUKE BURKE, O. F. M.

*Reprinted from the STANDARD\**

THE family is a unit in which there are several elements. In the happy and adjusted family, all these elements or strands are woven into a single pattern. Through faulty relationships between the parts, the unity and harmony of this pattern is destroyed.

With a minimum of sacrifice, husband and wife can settle down to their common life with feelings varying from mutual love to mutual toleration; but where many marriages fail is in the faulty relationships between parents and children.

It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the very early years of childhood are the most decisive in moulding a person's character and temperament, and in shaping his conduct for after life. The home circle, the family life—these are the first contacts the infant has with the outer world, with the world other than itself. The example learned in the home environment is first in the field, so to speak, and on the child mind it leaves an indelible mark. School life can influence greatly one way or the other, but the foundations are laid during the pre-school years: for good or ill the mould has already hardened and taken shape when it leaves the

hands of the parents. Hence, on those charged with the upbringing of children in their first five or six years of life devolves a large responsibility for the later moral and spiritual level of conduct. Yet, it is just this point that so many parents fail to appreciate, or do not understand.

To indicate the importance of these years, it will be well to quote the testimony of the eminent Catholic psychiatrist, Rudolf Allers:

Of all the people who do not find their level in life and are failures, who see that they are in danger of breaking down completely in the struggle, and invoke the aid of a doctor as a last resort, of all those whom I have seen in my consulting-room, fully 90 *per cent* owe their lot to childhood impressions, to the mistakes and misunderstandings occurring during their childhood.

In other words, the majority of nervous troubles are caused by mistakes in the upbringing of children. The conclusion is alarming, but nevertheless true.

Mistaken attitudes towards children fall into two main classes: excessive severity and excessive leniency. Of the two, the former in its consequences is by far the more serious. Petting and spoiling are, indeed, a bad preparation for life. The child

\* Standard House, Pearse St., Dublin, Eire, April 20, 1945

gets the idea that the world exists solely for his benefit. He is under the impression that success in life is an easy matter, and is acquired without effort or sacrifice. Such a view is obviously wrong; but it rarely lasts once the child begins to leave the environment of the home. School discipline or, better still, the hard experience of life itself, will eventually go a long way to neutralize and eliminate this childish view.\*

On the contrary, harshness or severity leaves a permanent scar. A loveless childhood breaks a man's spirit and stunts the normal growth of his mental life. His self-respect, his sense of personal value and worth, so necessary for successful living, are crushed and withered. He is permanently soured. Subsequent affection may compensate; but the lack of love in childhood is an irretrievable loss, and can never be restored by anyone.

The same error lies at the root of both of these mistaken attitudes towards children: namely, a misunderstanding of the meaning of authority, and hence of obedience. Any person wielding authority is granted that power solely for the good of inferiors. If used for any purpose, like personal aggrandizement, then it is no longer authority. Authority exists solely for the good of the persons over whom it is exercised. Therefore, it must never be imposed, but rather built up, founded on love. Harshness in any-

one is usually a sign of a conscious insecurity. The person who is really sure of his position and of his authority does not have to advertise this fact or make violent demonstrations of it. In the same way, the mother who asks in despair "Tell me how to make my children obey," misunderstands the meaning of authority, as she misunderstands the meaning of obedience. She has the wrong end of the stick in her hand.

#### PROS AND CONS OF PUNISHMENT

Mention of the rod brings us inevitably to the problem of discipline and of punishment, and this is a problem even in the best regulated families. Wrong-doing involves punishment, and of the connection between the two the child is quite aware. Hence, no greater mistake could be made than to replace punishment by explanation or instruction. Yet, instruction and punishment should never be separated, otherwise the child will lose his original understanding of the meaning of punishment, and, what is worse, will lose confidence in the justice of his parents. Every time a child is punished there must be a reason for it, and the parent should be sure that the wrong-doing is really malicious and intentional before administering a correction in the form of punishment.

Some people feel that it is an essential part of the home education to inflict punishment. They take it for

granted that the child's understanding is extremely limited, and that it is, therefore, useless to appeal to his reason. They conclude that the only way to enforce their will on the child is to hurt him. Some parents go the length of chastising their children when punishment is absolutely uncalled for, on the grounds that it helps to toughen them and to make men and women of them.

This is a most harmful practice. It is natural for the child to feel insecure. The whole adult world frightens him, and in this his parents are included. The gap between the child and his elders is considerably widened where there is a loss of confidence because of unjust and unnecessary punishment. The next time there is any real misbehavior or wrong-doing, to escape punishment, the child will resort to lying and deceit. The first lie is almost always due to fear of punishment. And since the child has not this fear inborn, the first lie is in large measure the result of faulty treatment on the part of the parents or others who have charge of it during its early years.

To quote again Dr. Rudolf Allers: "In nine cases out of ten, lying, cheating, deceit, excessive reserve, rebellion against school, stubbornness, shyness, in fact, most of the nervous disorders have their origin in fear." This should be a warning as well as a guidance to parents in the matter of discipline.

In addition to the over-severe attitude, there is the equally harmful one of general disapproval. It is usually expressed in the maxim — children should be seen, not heard. The feeling of self-respect, which the child lacks so much, and which is absolutely necessary as a basis for successful living, is retarded in growth and, perhaps, banished altogether by such an attitude of general distrust. Confidence and trust are necessary for the child if he is to acquire any feeling of personal value.

It may be a statement of fact and the unvarnished truth to say to a child—"You're good for nothing. You can't do anything. What a dunce, you'll never learn!" It may be the truth, but it is very bad psychology.

Of course, such statements can be used as a warning or as an occasional stimulus. But they are most harmful if used continually as statements of fact that are obvious enough for anyone to see. Moreover, a child tends to grow into what he is told he is. If it is continually drummed into his ears that he is good for nothing, that nobody wants him, sooner or later, the child comes to think that he is of no value, that he is worth nothing.

Feelings of inferiority and of insecurity are strongly present to the child mind; anything that leads to an increase of this lowers his sense of personal value and promotes the feeling of not being wanted. The knowledge that he counts for something, that his

parents really believe in him and in his worth, are vital necessities for every child no matter what his age, no matter what his achievements, no matter what his handicaps.

#### NATURE DOES NOT MAKE DUPLICATES

No two children are identical. Each child is unique, and differs from every other person in the world, even from his twin brother or sister. In mental qualities the difference is greater than in physical features. This is a point which is seldom understood even by the mother of the children. Consequently, the common practice of taking one child as the ideal, and enforcing all the others to conform to it in every way, is as harmful as it is futile. In the training of children, it is the outstanding individual qualities that should be given a chance to develop. The aim is not, as is often said, to break the child's will. What the child needs most, and what he rarely

receives is guidance and direction.

There is scarcely any need to remark that the training and upbringing of children is something different from the training of animals. But how often do we notice more care, more patience, more tact, more perseverance in the training of animals than of children?

With children there should not be too many "Don'ts"; there should not be too many prohibitions. If one forbids too much one gains nothing, for it is characteristic of children, as of people in general, to be attracted by what is forbidden. Moreover, to issue orders merely that the child may learn to obey is quite unnecessary. If one takes the trouble to observe, it will be found that children have a very delicate sense of the reason or unreason of the orders issued and of the punishments meted out to them by adults.



### Victory

The Romans made war and peace according to the maxim *Vae Victis*, Woe to the conquered. We have traveled a long way beyond the Romans—we have traveled the Christian way. Christianity teaches humility to the victor as well as the vanquished. And the victors in this war—at least such of them as are Christians—may remember that victory is not theirs but God's, and that war will be theirs if they do not use victory in God's way, that is, in the way of justice and charity.—NEW LEADER, *Madras, India, March 11, 1945.*

# *Selfishness Causes Divorce*

THE SIFTER

*Reprinted from ZEALANDIA\**

**I**N SPITE of the war some activities of the social whirl seem to be still moving giddily around. A recent paragraph in an overseas paper says that "in 1944 Britain scored the highest number of divorces ever reached in one year, namely, 12,500. This total is likely to be surpassed in 1945."

This divorce mill! One kind of mill that certainly doesn't grind slowly. Why this mass renegeing from the marriage contract? Why the drastic change from "I can't live without you" to "I'm weary of living with you"?

Some frank cynic remarks: "You can't choose your ancestors. But that's fair enough. Probably some of them wouldn't have chosen you." But you do choose your wife (or do you?). Whichever way it is, once the choosing has been done, no matter who did it, why not play fair and see the contract through?

How optimistically you start out! These roseate dreams and illusions. This subconscious self-deception which, prior to marriage, persuades you into the fond delusion that the other party is some wonderful creature whose like the world never saw until now, and that perfect bliss is

already waiting around the corner for you. Likely as not you got that way through reading too many novels of the kind that tell you how "she put her red-gold head on his shoulder and sighed happily." Well, I daresay folks still do a bit of sighing after they're married, but maybe not so happily.

It's not common sense, of course, to expect life to be one long idyll for you, even when you're married, especially when you reflect that you probably wouldn't win any gold medals, yourself as the perfect subject for an idyll. But it's usually taken for granted that both parties to the set-up have some degree of idealistic conception of one another when they decide to take on the contract. And of course each of the parties may be a real gem in the personal sense, a pearl beyond price, yeah, or even in the solid diamond class like you buy at Woolworths'.

But what causes this change of sentiment, so pronounced that it has the divorce court breaking time records? A detailed answer, even in reasonably restricted detail, would of course fill volumes. Then again it could perhaps be comprehensively summed up in the observation that one

\* 2 St. Patrick's Square, Auckland CI, N. Z., April 5, 1945.

of the parties has allowed his or her exacting selfishness to take charge, and hasn't played the game.

In most cases the disillusionment doesn't arise out of any serious breach of the matrimonial code. Usually it has its beginnings in the lesser faults, the petty meannesses, the little discourtesies which are so irritating and which create a sense of resentment that keeps feeding on its grievances. You begin to appreciate the aptness of the saying that "repartee is what you think of afterwards," what you wish you'd said when the argument was on. So maybe you keep it in pickle for another time.

#### PETTY FRICTION

Meannesses and wisecracks, we were saying. The wife thinks she needs a new hat (and maybe all the evidence is in her favor, at that). So she buys one and that evening she puts it on and comes in to where hubby is sitting reading the racing news.

"Well," says she, "don't you like my new hat?"

"Oh, it's a new one, is it?" he says, kind of feeble and with a look of dismay like that on the face of a small boy who has accidentally swallowed a fishing worm.

"Didn't you *know* it was!" she says, posing and turning and twisting. "Look at it."

"I am," he says in a voice like the Dead March, because he'd been figuring out whether he'd be able to get

along next week to see the races.

"Well, thank goodness, all my troubles are over now," says she.

"Sure, honey!" says he, "but a clever little girl like you can always think up a new trouble or two any old time."

And there you are, all set for a rift within the lute. Whereas any married man ought to know that whether she needs a new hat or not a woman has to be in the fashion and that, as someone puts it, "women would rather dress like every other woman and look terrible than dress differently and look beautiful as their own beautiful self." Nothing on earth contributes more to a woman's sense of ease and self-possession than to know that she's dressed in the current fashion and that her make-up is holding good.

So it's a matter that a gentleman should regard with the proper consideration. And every married man should have the qualities of a gentleman in his composition. Perhaps he does, but lets them get atrophied. Or if they don't exactly get atrophied, they often become pretty rusty for want of use. Usage stales a good many things, but there's one thing that never stales, never loses its charm with usage, and that is, genuine courtesy.

And there you have the chances of the personal element again. You're not likely to get overmuch courtesy from the smart-alec sort of husband who can think of a wisecrack for almost everything you say. The lady



decides, perhaps, that she's got a new idea about something.

"Bill," she says by way of preliminary, "I've been thinking . . ."

And before she can get any further with it he cuts in with: "Have you, dear! Well, I wish you beginners' luck, anyhow." Just like that, ha-ha-ha.

And by the time she's grasped what he means, she sure feels that what she wants to say to him is something very, very different indeed from what she first thought of. And it's no use giving him a look that ought to wither him: he's simply unwitherable. Reminds me of the American lady who protested: "The only way anybody could be more rude to people than you are to me would be to cut their throats."

Or perhaps he's reading the advertisements in the evening paper, and comes across one from a deaf lady who is sending out an S.O.S. for a husband. But a careless printer (who is probably thinking of some of our Government departments) improves the matrimonial appeal with a misprint: "Middle-aged lady, slightly dead, wishes to correspond etc., view to matrimony." And that's another horse laugh for hubby. "Slightly dead!" says he. "Ain't they all! . . . well, dumb, anyhow."

Then there's the petty-minded husband who keeps on interfering in matters that he ought to be glad to leave alone, rushing in where wise men are quite content to sit back.

For instance the wife's domestic finance system may work in what may seem to be mysterious and inscrutable ways, but if the lord and master will only leave himself out of it and bottle-up his advice, things usually have a remarkable way of coming out all right.

However, the faults are not by any means always on the male side. I shouldn't be surprised if, very often, the lady partner has far too much Martha and not enough Mary in her outlook. The question of temperament again. An American humorist suggests that

*Some women will suffer weeks of remorse after having committed the slightest peccadillo;*

*And other women will feel perfectly all right after feeding their husbands arsenic or smothering their mother-in-law with a pillow.*

An exaggeration, of course, and moreover quite absurd. Look up the statistics and find out for yourself how many mothers-in-law get smothered with pillows. Nonsense, isn't it! And about the husbands. I wouldn't doubt that there are wives whose chief joy in domestic life seems to be in making their husband look as insignificant as a minority report. Well, isn't he, anyway? But as for arsenic, goodness me, where's this domestic joy going to be then?

Oh well, these illusions before marriage and disillusion after; the petty friction and clashing which could so

easily be avoided and which so often leads to the graver things that end up with the divorce court. Why have them? If you have the Christian outlook on marriage with the right understanding of its responsibilities and difficulties, and of your own obligations in face of the difficulties, well, you'll be so much the more likely to approach the question sanely and soberly and not be looking for some impossible kind of penny-novelette paradise on earth with laughter unceasingly in your heart and pansies

perpetually stuck in your hair, and all that. If you're not looking for too much, you're not likely to be so disappointed.

What's more, if you genuinely have this Christian viewpoint, you'll be prepared to sink your selfishness a bit and put the soft pedal on your assertiveness. If the qualities of loyalty, courage and sweet reasonableness were given anything like their due place in married life, the divorce court would soon be getting cobwebs across the door.



### *Vocation*

It is a thought-provoking fact that every child born into the world, whether in favorable or adverse circumstances, is created not only to know, love and serve God, but to do something, or to be something, for which no one else is created. But just as talents differ widely in individuals, so do the tasks God assigns them. While one soul is meant to perform seemingly commonplace duties, another is destined to work out some very special design of the Creator, Who ordinarily acts through human agencies. When God wills to have some great work done for His Church, He selects the person best fitted to co-operate with Him, one whose peculiar gifts, capabilities and experiences are most serviceable for the particular end in view. And yet it would seem to us that He sometimes breaks in, so to speak, and prepares for such a work, one who is among the least promising of human agents.—*Brother S. J. Curran, F.S.C. in THE IRISH ECCLESIASTICAL RECORD, July, 1944.*

# *Fifty-Two Pay-Checks A Year*

BY THE EDITORS

*Reprinted from WORK\**

## WHAT IS THE GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE PLAN?

**I**T IS the plan to put wages on an annual basis. It springs from the idea that workers are entitled to the security of a regular income and that the loss of wages due to causes beyond their control is not just. It would provide an income for a worker and his family not only when he is working, but also when he is not working through no fault of his own. It would assure him of a definite annual income regardless of the fluctuations in working hours or economic conditions.

## IS THE GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE A CURE-ALL FOR OUR ECONOMIC TROUBLES?

It certainly isn't. But we don't see how it is possible to provide economic security for all without stabilizing workers' incomes and thus their purchasing power by putting workers' wages on an annual basis. We don't see how any plan to provide full employment for everyone after the war can succeed unless it provides for a guaranteed annual wage. Such a wage plan won't solve all our economic problems, but it is a big step in that direction.

## WHY BEGIN WITH SPECIAL GUARANTEES TO PROTECT WORKERS?

As a matter of fact, workers are the last to get any kind of guarantee. Bond-holders are guaranteed their interest. Companies have tried to regularize the payment of dividends and have set aside funds to pay both interest and dividends after the war, no matter how bad business is. Executives, too, are carried along on the pay roll, regardless of business conditions. It is about time, therefore, that wage-earners and the vast number of day workers also enjoy a guaranteed income.

Of course, executives are important and have a right to encouragement and adequate support from industry. Money-lenders too have a right to a small return on their investments. But the decent living of the workers comes before all. It is time that this fact be recognized as the first obligation of industry.

## WOULD IT BE AN UNBEARABLE BURDEN ON INDUSTRY?

Actually the greatest burden on industry is unemployment or an inadequate purchasing power in the hands of workers. The biggest obstacles to continued production are the empty pocketbooks of American workers who need goods but don't have the money to buy them.

\* 3 East Chicago Ave., Chicago 11, Ill., May, 1945

The greatest boon of an annual wage to industry might easily be confidence and stability. Says Eric Johnston: "Every time we assure one man a regular job, we make it easier to extend the assurance to still more workers. Just as instability tends to be cumulative and contagious, so stability tends to expand its beneficial influences throughout the business structure."

Steady employment ought to be the first concern of industry. Nevertheless, according to Eric Johnston, president of the U. S. Chamber of Commerce:

Steady employment generally has not had enough attention from top management. Finance, purchasing, sales and production have come first. Yet regular employment is of equal importance. I hope that the day is near when the job of providing steadier employment will be assigned to the president or the first vice-president in every concern in the country, and will receive the serious consideration of every small businessman. Then, and then only, shall we make significant progress toward providing steadier jobs.

It might be noted that the guaranteed annual wage plan at Procter and Gamble Company didn't prevent a \$20,000,000 profit last year.

#### WON'T THE OBSTACLE BE PRACTICALLY INSURMOUNTABLE?

Insurmountable obstacles have been overcome before. It was once thought that unemployment compensation was hopelessly visionary and would result in economic ruin. The visionaries now

have been justified; there has been no economic catastrophe.

There are certainly some industries where employment is very unsteady, but even these can adopt annual wage plans if we all pull together. But there are major industries like steel where employment could be easily stabilized and wages guaranteed if they were attacked on an industry-wide basis, and especially if employment and wages were stabilized in those industries that use steel.

#### WILL INDUSTRY SUPPORT THE PLAN FOR A GUARANTEED ANNUAL WAGE?

As a matter of fact, a good number of employers are seeking that goal. The president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has been an ardent advocate of the idea. He has cited many instances where employers have worked out arrangements with other employers whose employment peaks came at different seasons.

A coal dealer's employment showed a winter peak. He got together with two other local merchants, whose pay rolls are heaviest in the summer. Together they worked out a plan for lending men and equipment back and forth. As a result, practically, all the men now have year-round employment, instead of only five per cent, as before.

A toy manufacturer developed a system of graduated discounts to encourage earlier orders. In addition, he has improved the quality and stepped up the promotion of one of his products for which the demand came principally in the slack

season. The results have been very helpful in regularizing production, and therefore employment.

#### TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE UNIONS SUPPORTING THE GUARANTEED WAGE?

AFL unions which have annual wage or employment guarantees in their contracts include: United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers, International Ladies Garment Workers, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Commercial Telegraphers' Union and Brotherhood of Painters, Decorators and Paperhangers

CIO unions with similar security guarantees are: United Steelworkers, Food, Tobacco and Agricultural Workers, United Packinghouse Workers, United Electrical Workers, United Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Employees, International Fur and Leather Workers, United Office and Professional Workers and Textile Workers' Union.

The drive to extend the guaranteed wage plan to all industries has won the backing of both the CIO and AFL.

Says CIO President, Philip Murray:

There is nothing socialistic or revolutionary in the idea of a guaranteed annual wage. The idea would amount to nothing if it were a selfish plan designated to help only a few people. It must be accepted by industry on the basis of its being helpful to the national well-being, to the interests of the nation—to all of the people throughout the nation.

The idea must take precedence over selling apples on street corners.

Says AFL President, William Green:

The experiences of the past twelve years have demonstrated the workability of the guaranteed annual wage. As a result of collective bargaining negotiations, the annual wage guarantee has become a reality in many widely diversified sections of industry. In many instances its worth has been tested over a period of years. Union agreements providing for a guaranteed annual wage have been put into effect in a number of manufacturing plants, in meat packing and food distribution, and in service trades, such as laundries. In addition, there are a number of agreements which provide for partial stabilization of income on a semi-annual or quarterly base.

#### ARE THERE ANY WORKERS WHO ARE NOW COVERED BY GUARANTEED WAGE CONTRACTS?

The Bureau of Labor Statistics examined employer-labor contracts covering 8,000,000 workers and found only about 43,500 workers covered by guaranteed wage or guaranteed employment provisions.

There are the celebrated guaranteed wage plans in operation at the Hormel plants, and the Nunn-Bush Shoe Company, and at Procter and Gamble.

Obviously this is largely an unexplored field in American labor relations and economic practices.

#### HOW DOES IT FIT INTO THE PAPAL PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC REFORM?

Bishop Sheil told the CIO conven-

tion last fall: "I believe that the guaranteed annual wage for the working man is just; it is socially necessary; it is economically feasible; it is a democratic imperative." The Bishop cited Pius XI's words in the Encyclical *On the Reconstruction of the Social Order* to support his opinion:

In the first place, the wage paid to the working man must be sufficient for the support of himself and his family. . . . Every effort must therefore be made that fathers of families receive a wage sufficient to meet adequately ordinary domestic needs. If in the present state of society this is not always feasible, social justice demands that reforms be introduced without delay which will guarantee every adult working man just such a wage. . . .

The guaranteed annual wage is such a reform.

#### WILL LEGISLATION BE NECESSARY TO PUT IT INTO OPERATION?

Without government help it appears unlikely that annual wages will become, quickly enough, a part of American economic life to forestall serious economic upheavals in the post-war world. Father Benjamin Masse, S.J., in *America*, April 28, 1945, outlines what seems to be the necessary legislative program:

I would have the Congress enact a law along these lines: The Federal Government, recognizing the rich advantages which derive from uninterrupted income and the suffering and discord which flow from the fear of unemployment, pledges itself to guarantee up to eighty-five per

cent any annual wage contract entered into by labor and management as a result of collective bargaining. It likewise agrees to underwrite any legally binding commitment made by an employer to unorganized workers to pay them an annual wage.

#### IS THERE ANY NATION-WIDE PLAN TO PUT IT INTO OPERATION?

The late President Roosevelt ordered the advisory board of the Office of War Mobilization to launch a comprehensive inquiry into the question of establishing a guaranteed annual wage for American workers. He believed that the annual wage was "closely connected with problems of reconversion from a war to peacetime economy." Previously, the public, industry, and labor members of the WLB had unanimously recommended that the whole question be comprehensively studied on a national scale.

#### YES, BUT WILL THE PUBLIC BENEFIT BY IT?

The public stands to gain through the creation of an economic system where production and employment will be steady, where living standards can be maintained, where depressions, which ultimately affect everyone in the nation, will be at least mitigated. In Austin, Minn., where an annual wage plan was put into effect at the Hormel Packing Co., the Austin community never really felt the hardships of the depression.

## Laymen and the Papal Peace Program

WILLIAM J. DONAGHY, S.J.

THROUGH all the black gloom and scarlet agony of war, in the mists of propaganda and the Babel of snarling voices speaking the common language of hatred in different tongues, there has stood, calm and immovable, a man in white uttering words of eternal and unshakable wisdom. He is Pius XII, Our Holy Father, Vicar of Christ on earth.

He has long been an enemy of the sword, a passionate advocate of peace. As Papal Secretary of State under Pius XI, he and his illustrious predecessor fought tirelessly against war as a solvent for the world's inequalities. This is evident to anyone who has read a book like Camille Ciarfarra's *The Vatican and the War*. Now, as Supreme Pontiff, he may go down in history as the Pope of Peace. His coat of arms centers a dove with an olive branch in his beak; his motto is "Peace, the work of justice" (*Opus justitiae pax*). His first address on the radio, the day after his election, was on peace, and he has renewed that message many times since.

From the Vatican he sees the whole world with the unfalteringly neutral gaze of a common father. True, he is pledged to strict neutrality by the twenty-fourth article of the Lateran Treaty. But in addition to the bleak obligations of a pact, he is neutral

*Address delivered at a Knights of Columbus Communion Breakfast, New Bedford, Mass., May 6, 1945.*

because of his primary preoccupation with truth, justice, charity and because his paternal solicitude extends to all.

Thinking men have come more and more to look to him for guidance. To be sure, H. G. Wells barbarously suggested the bombing of Vatican City during the Italian campaign; unfortunately various sectarian bodies in the United States have formally protested the deference accorded to the Holy Father; and Soviet Russia continues her implacable warfare against the Holy See. But more men have come to indorse the insight of the German poet, Goethe, who spoke of

"The lofty outlook of the Pope who sees

The small as small, and what is great, as great."

On the thundrous eve of war, August 24, 1939, he begged a snarling world to reconsider before it was too late. So twenty-five years before, on November 1, 1914, had Pope Benedict XV pleaded with a war-lusty world; but both Benedict and Pius were ignored. In the year 1940 alone, Pius XII made twenty-eight different

appeals for peace, and in his Episcopal Jubilee Address, April 13, 1941, he was able to declare that he had labored, both before the outbreak of war and after it, "to forestall or shorten this conflict, to humanize methods of war, to alleviate suffering and to bring assistance and comfort to the victims of war."

#### HIS PEACE PLAN

Besides being Supreme Pontiff, Pius is probably the greatest statesman of modern times. His diplomatic background is rich and varied, his information thorough and global, his mind profound and his heart deeply sympathetic. Hence he did not content himself with mere exhortation but proposed a peace plan of cosmic sweep and significance, first set forth in his Christmas message, December 24, 1939. Indicative of its breadth and practical solidity is the fact that, in 1940, the heads of the Anglican and Free Churches of England joined the Catholic Cardinal Hinsley in a letter to the *Times*, to accept the Pope's peace outline as an official ideal.

Through his Christmas message of the next four years, Pius evolved and developed his original five-point formula and from these addresses and his other speeches and writings, students of the Papal mind have collected and collated the whole balanced and organic peace proposal.

In the political order, the Pope

vigorously vindicates the rights of all nations, large, small, rich or poor, to national life and independence. No nation's will to live must become the death warrant of any other nation. He demands respect for the rights of all racial and religious minorities and sternly reminds governments of their obligation to defend the rights of such groups. He emphatically repudiates "power politics" and the necessary consequences of international nervousness, suspicion, tension. Against the "cold, calculating egoism" which results in selfish, centripetal nationalism he is especially strong, calling on all peoples to exorcise this evil spirit from their hearts and their lands. To maintain the peace, he advocates the establishment of permanent, preservative international institutions. Finally, he asks for sincere, mutual, progressive disarmament to lift a crushing burden from man's shoulders and man's soul. You will all recall the "Fourth Freedom" proposed by the late President Roosevelt in his Annual Message to Congress, January 6, 1941—Freedom from fear to be brought about by disarmament.

In the social order, he directs attention to four fundamental truths which must be recognized unless the world is again to be engulfed in blood and sweat and tears. Governments must acknowledge and protect the basic rights of the human person. Too many systems in our day have made of man a shapeless, faceless cog



in the machine of the state, without rights and without redress. Man's essential dignity, as the image of God, must be appreciated, as Catholic, Protestant and Jewish leaders likewise insisted in their "Declaration on World Peace." Secondly, the various classes of the nation must achieve social unity by close cooperation, each class working towards that goal which is greater than any one class, namely, the *common* good. The family, debased by divorce and loose morality, must again be exalted to its true and holy position as the cornerstone of society. Lastly, all men must appreciate the high dignity of work and the rights of labor, especially the rights to a living wage and to private property, not possessed by a feudal few, but widely distributed in the light of the Papal social encyclicals.

#### MORAL REFORM

In the moral order, man must win the greatest victory of the war on the battlefield of his own soul, the conquest of that sulphurous hatred which could dictate a peace of vengeance and leave the vanquished smouldering and sullen. There must be a universal recognition of that juridic order which is the sum total of the rights and obligations of individuals and nations; an admission that there are principles superior to expediency; a denial of that vicious legal utilitarianism which makes might right. Man must conform his thinking to the

Christian ideal, revitalize his sense of responsibility and measure human law by Divine, adhering to the former through reverence for the latter, hungering and thirsting after justice, regulating all things by charity.

In the economic order, he calls for an advancing spirit of collaboration to ensure a proper standard of living for the citizens of each country, and an end to the hoarding of those economic resources destined by the Creator for the use of all.

But most important is the Papal plea to all men to return to God and to faith in God, the Supreme Legislator and Judge Who alone can give us the fortitude and courage necessary for the staggering task ahead of us. Once before Europe was reduced to rubble by the barbarian invasions. Out of the wreckage men of faith built up another Europe and it is significant that their masterpiece was not a theater or a mercantile house but a Gothic Cathedral. Seen even in its skeletal outline, the Papal peace plan is obviously a formula which could bring internal quiet to the restless nations and bind the world together in perduring international harmony.

Some share of the responsibility for future peace rests on each man. The Pope is not an academician planning Utopias in an ivory tower. He is a practical statesman whose proposals will succeed only if he has the cooperation not only of Catholics, but of all men of good will. It is for us to study

those proposals, make ourselves familiar with them and give them the widest possible circulation. In his letter, *Sertum Laetitia*, written to the United States on the one-hundred-and-fiftieth anniversary of the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy in this country, he stresses again the need of a lay apostolate. "The Christian, if he does honor to the name he bears, is always an apostle." And again, in the *Summi Pontificatus*, he declares that for truly Christian men "'Thy kingdom come' is not simply the burning desire of their prayers; it is besides, the guide of their activity." While this challenge is addressed primarily to Catholics, it includes "all believers in God and in Christ" who should "share the consciousness of a common threat from a common danger."

#### WAR AND REVOLUTION

Make no mistake about the existence or the extent of that danger. It is all too easy to become confused as one views the present involved situation. There are at large any number of prophets who will pitch their portable pulpits and give us a swift and easy over-simplification of the problem and its solution. This struggle of our times proceeds on two distinct levels, as Christopher Dawson and Monsignor Sheen have pointed out. There is the war and there is the revolution. The war is a relatively easy matter to understand—it is army against army, fleet against fleet, tank

and plane against tank and plane.

But beyond the war there is the revolution. The war is man against man, the revolution mind against mind. It is fought not with bullets or bayonets but with books, with ideas. Far behind the flaming fronts of battle are the inflammatory ideologies which flared up into war. Behind every pale boy dead on the field of battle is the pale professor or philosopher who thought up the particular distortion of truth for which that boy was required to die.

Now the fact is that we can win the war and lose the revolution. We have, by numerical and inventive superiority and by the courage of our men, conquered one enemy, reduced him to helplessness, imposed our will on him. But we can at the same time lose the revolution if we leave those contagious ideas still alive and fertile to infect future generations, and produce once again the tragic harvest of crosses, row on row. As the Bishops of the United States said, in their Statement on Peace, November 18, 1944, this war was brought on not "by primitives or unlettered peoples . . ." but by "scholars."\* You must combat ideas with ideas.

The whole problem goes back four hundred years or so, when liberal theology first nailed its theses to the Wurttemberg door. As Jacques Maritain has said, in a penetrating critique of the man who led that revolt, the

\* CATHOLIC MIND, JANUARY, 1945.

first thing about him which strikes one is his "egocentrism." Man then began to exalt himself and his own ego, to revise the ancient Creed to read: "I believe in God as I can conceive Him, as He makes Himself apparent to me personally." It was the revival of an antique Grecian mentality which made man the measure of all things.

#### EVOLUTION OF RACISM

From this exaltation of the ego came chauvinism, excessive nationalism, jingoism; because, as Hilare Belloc has sagely observed, nationalism is only the big brother of egoism, a wider, subtler form of self-worship. Deep in man is the appetite and capacity for worship; take God away, and he turns to some other object of adoration, as de la Bedoyere indicates in his splendid book *Christianity in the Marketplace*. He may worship some vague humanitarianism or, especially in time of war, the nation. But whatever the alternative, man without God is a savage, civilization without God is a sham and by the slow working of natural causes will inevitably become a shambles.

The only solution is a re-orientation of man, a returning to God. For the difficulty is basically intellectual, specifically spiritual and, indeed, theological. You cannot hope to cure a theological cancer with a merely economic or political poultice. The only hope for the future is that man who

got down on his knees to get a better bead on his enemy, will drop the gun and stay on his knees.

Man has tried everything else, he is ripe for that revolution which will turn him back to God. At the dawn of the century we were very sure of ourselves. There was nothing above the ceiling, science was conquering nature and life for us, we were lords of the universe. But suddenly the lamp of knowledge blew up in our faces and became a flame-thrower; twice in our memory rebellious man, who would not kneel in humility, was beaten to his knees by the sheer weight of adversity. Many of his certitudes were shattered; he heard the sad bugle melody of "Taps" ring across the world as national anthem to nations once proud and mighty. He is ready now, through fear and exhaustion, for spiritual reclamation.

"So let your light shine before men that they may see your works and glorify your Father Who is in Heaven." With these solemn words Our Lord laid on all of us the injunction to preach daily and hourly the irrefutable sermon of example. Yours is a very definite and important part in this spiritual reclamation of the world. Pope after Pope, moreover, has summoned you to the great Crusade of Catholic Action which is defined by Pius XI, of blessed memory, as "the participation of the laity in the apostolate of the hierarchy." And Pius XII looks, in these troubled times, for

laymen whom he describes as alert, vigilant, well-informed, well-read, articulate, able by their prestige and their knowledge to influence the decisions being made about the postwar world and to illuminate them with Christ's justice and charity. They must be men of real, constant prayer, men who appreciate the primary place of their religion in their lives, apostolic men of zeal and infectious enthusiasm which is, at the same time, intelligent.

#### KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

Your very name commits you to the cause of Christ—Knights of Columbus. The idea of knight has all the connotations of courage, fortitude and devotion to Our Lord and Our

Lady. The knights of Godfrey de Bouillon went into battle with the war-cry "*Deus Vult*," "God Wills it." They fought to capture Jerusalem and the Tomb where Christ's Body lay dead for three days. The inspiration of our battle is not the tomb where He lay dead but the tabernacle where He gloriously and sacramentally lives for us. "Columbus," too, is a name rich in significance, symbolic of hardihood, the bravery of a pioneer, long vision, the ability to lead the way to brighter and broader horizons. Can you really call yourselves true Knights of Columbus unless you get into the battle, as loyal sons of our Mother the Church, filial subjects of your great Bishop, indomitable crusaders for God and the right? I do not think so.

### THE CATHOLIC MIND

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: John LaFarge      EXECUTIVE EDITOR: B. L. MASSE  
With the collaboration of the *AMERICA* staff

EDITORIAL ASSISTANTS: William H. Dodd, Henry Watts

EDITORIAL OFFICE: 329 West 108th St., New York, N. Y.

PUBLISHER: Gerald C. Treacy      BUSINESS MANAGER: Joseph Carroll

BUSINESS OFFICE: 70 East 45th St., New York 17, N. Y.